Vol. LXXXVII No. 3 September, 1932

The Ecclesiastical Review

A Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

MYSTICISM OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI 225
The Rev. Father CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C., Assisi, Italy.
MARRIAGE CASES DECIDED BY ROTA IN 1931 237
Some Interesting Sidelights.
The Rev. VALENTINE SCHAAF, O.F.M., S.T.B., J.C.D., Washington, D. C.
CONFRATERNITY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE AT WORK, II 242
The Rev. RAYMOND J. PRINDIVILLE, C.S.P., San Francisco, California.
A POINT OF VIEW IN PREACHING. The Blessed Sacrament 250
The Rev. WILLIAM J. KERBY, Ph.D., Catholic University of America.
NEAR-KIN MARRIAGES. The Ethics of Human Inbreeding, II 259
The Rev. JOHN M. COOPER, Ph.D., S.T.D., Brookland, D. C.
A GREAT ELIZABETHAN CARDINAL. William Allen, 1532-1594 273
JOSCELYNE LECHMERE, Falmouth, England.
NEW INDULGENCES FOR VISIT TO MOST BLESSED SACRAMENT 283
FEAST OF SS. ISAAC JOGUES, JOHN DE BREBEUF AND THEIR COMPANIONS, 26 September 286
TOWARD INTELLIGENT APPRECIATION OF THE BREVIARY 291
The Most Rev. PHILIP R. McDEVITT, D.D., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
CONSUMING THE SACRED HOST 295
The Rev. D. J. DEW, M.S.C., Douglas Park, N.S.W., Australia.
IS DIVORCE DECLINING IN THE UNITED STATES? 296
The Rev. ALBERT F. KAISER, C.PP.S., Cleveland, Ohio.
HIS IPSE DIXITS 296
The Rev. GILES STAAB, O.M.Cap., Victoria, Kansas.
REDUCTION OF MASSES "PRO POPULO" 301
BAPTISM OUTSIDE ONE'S PROPER PARISH 304
PASTOR'S JURISDICTION OVER PARISH SOCIETIES 307
"BUNCHING" LOW MASSES INTO HIGH MASSES 311

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

PUBLISHED BY BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF THE
AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
FOR
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

PUBLISHED
113 E. Chestnut Street
Lancaster, Pa.

1722 Arch Street
PHILADELPHIA

GENERAL OFFICES
1722 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1932. American Ecclesiastical Review

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional
Agents { Great Britain: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., 43 Newgate St., London, E. C. 1, England.
Ireland: Veritas Company, Ltd., 7 & 8 Lower Abbey St., Dublin
Australia: W. P. Linehan, 8 Bourke St., Melbourne
Entered, 2 July, 1904, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879
March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925

CONTENTS CONTINUED

ANALECTA:

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE:
Ampliantur Indulgentiae concessae pro Visitatione Ssmi Eucharistiae Sacramenti 283

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII:
Decretum de Gratiarum et Oblationum in Piis Ephemeridibus evulgatione . 284

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES:
Proper Office and Mass of SS. Isaac Jogues, John de Brebeuf, and their Companions, approved 286

SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA:
I. Decretum de Indulgentiis "Stationibus" adnexis 287
II. Archiconfraternitati Doctrinae Christianae Adscriptis Nova Indulgentia Plenaria conceditur 288

DIARIUM ROMANAE CURIAE:
Recent Pontifical Appointments 288

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month 290
Toward Intelligent Appreciation of the Breviary. (*The Most Rev. Philip R. McDevitt, D.D., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.*) 291
Consuming the Sacred Host. (*The Rev. D. J. Dew, M.S.C., Douglas Park, N.S.W., Australia.*) 295
Is Divorce Declining in the United States? (*The Rev. Albert F. Kaiser, C.PP.S., Cleveland, Ohio.*) 296
His Ipse Dixits. (*The Rev. Giles Staab, O.M.Cap., Victoria, Kansas.*) 296
Reduction of Masses "pro Populo" 301
Baptism outside One's Proper Parish 304
Pastor's Jurisdiction over Parish Societies 307
"Bunching" Low Masses into High Masses 311
Proscription of a Periodical 313
Cope at Exposition of the Most Blessed Sacrament 314
Kneeling at "Et incarnatus est" during Mass 314
Liturgical Melody of "Ite, Missa Est" Obligatory 317
Distributing Communion from Both Ends of Sanctuary Rail 317
Relieving a Priest who is giving Communion 318
One or More Lighted Candles when Tabernacle is opened 318
Genuflexion when Kissing Bishop's Ring 318
Gloria and Credo at Nuptial Mass During Octave of Sacred Heart 319

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Grandmaison: Jésus Christ, Sa Personne, Son Message, Ses Preuves 320
Husslein: The Christian Social Manifesto 321
Joannis a S. Thoma-Reiser: Cursus Philosophicus Thomisticus 323
Schmiedeler: Readings on the Family 324
De la Selle: La Defense de l'Intelligence 325
Viller: La Spiritualité des Premiers Siècles Chrétiens 325
Confrey: Secularism in American Education 326
Gerster a Zeil: Familia Veteris Foederis 327
Hanssens: Institutiones Liturgicae de Ritibus Orientalibus 328

LITERARY CHAT ..... 330 **BOOKS RECEIVED** 334

ESSENTIALIA PHILOSOPHIAE

Quae in Usum Incipientium Digessit

FRANCISCUS P. SIEGFRIED

Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged

olim in Seminario S. Caroli Borromaei Philadelphiense Professor

Pocket Summary of Catholic Philosophy, giving the essentials of **Logic, Ontology, Cosmology, Psychology, Theodicy, Ethics,** briefly, clearly, in form of question and answer.

All set forth in graphic survey. For students of Philosophy in the Seminary and for maturer students who desire to make a rapid review of their Philosophy.

$1.80 a copy postpaid

The Dolphin Press - - - 1722 Arch Street, Philadelphia

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

NINTH SERIES.—VOL. VII.—(LXXXVII).—SEPTEMBER, 1932.—NO. 3.

THE MYSTICISM OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI.

His Sacramental View of the Visible World.

I.

ALL saints are mystics: not that they are all expounders of the mystical life like a St. Bernard or St. John of the Cross; or even conscious pursuers of some mystical method. But mystical union with God and the mystical outlook on life is of the essence of sanctity, as it is in fact of all true religion. For the mystical life in its essence is nothing else than the conscious union of the soul with God in the exercise of the three great virtues of faith, hope and charity.

But it is evident to all who are acquainted with the lives of the saints that the path of the mystical life is not one and uniform for all men. Some attain to the union with God in one way, some in another. True, there are certain fundamental states or conditions through which all souls must pass before they attain to perfect union with God. The soul must first come to know God with a certain intimate knowledge before it can come to love Him with that love in which the mystical union with God is established; and as the soul comes to know God its affections must be purified and estranged from whatever is ungodlike or unworthy of God, so that God may reign supreme in mind and heart. Only so can knowledge lead to perfect love. By whatever road the soul would come to God, it must pass through these stages of illumination and purification.

Nevertheless the mystical life has many paths: all are not called to walk the same path. Hence it is that we can speak of the mysticism of St. Francis of Assisi as something differ-

ent in character from the mysticism of other Catholic leaders in the spiritual life. The goal they all aim at is the same: union with God in Christ. And yet not only do they arrive at the goal by different paths, but in their final union with God, they retain the impress of the paths they have followed and set forth the beauty of holiness, each in a character which is his own.

Now the peculiar trait in the inner life of St. Francis and that which marks him off from many other saints, is what we may call his sacramental view of the visible world. He loved the visible world as few saints have loved it. In early youth he would gaze upon the Umbrian valley and drink in the scene before him. Nature was to him a delight. His earliest biographer, Thomas of Celano, tells how after his return to Assisi from captivity as a prisoner of war in Perugia, he was struck down with fever. As soon as he was able to go out again, he went to gaze upon the beauty of the surrounding country and was grieved because the valley and the hills gave him no joy. He was of course suffering from the depression caused by fever. But the fact that he sought an accustomed delight in gazing upon the landscape, reveals the man he was. With his return to health his joy in Nature came back to him and remained with him and deepened as the years went on.

The remarkable sympathy between St. Francis and Nature reveals itself to the pilgrim who visits the various retreats whither the Saint would retire to gather or to renew his spiritual strength and peace. In the time of his great agony of soul, when he had need to brace himself for the defence of his Rule against certain influential murmurers, it was to the grim natural fortresses (for such they may be called) of Fonte Colombo and Poggio Bustone that he betook himself. When his soul had regained its peace, we find him spending the Christmas festival in the idyllic homeliness of Greccio. To the height of Alverna—mystic in its aloofness from the world of men—he went to be alone with his Redeemer when the great mystery of the Passion was calling him. At another time, when he would renew his soul in silent communion with God, he flees to a sparsely inhabited island in Lake Thrasymene. Again, the retreat of the Celle near Cortona, deep down between the hills with the mountain stream splashing the walls

of the hermitage; and the hermitage of Monte Casale set in a mountain cliff with a foaming cascade nearby falling in the deep ravine beneath—both were natural backgrounds for the spiritual states of the Saint when he sought their company: for company these places undoubtedly were to him. And what more fitting nursery could there be for the sons of the Lady Poverty than that "place" in the wood outside Assisi with its tiny chapel, the Porziuncola? All his life in its great psychological moments had a fitting background in the natural environment he sought for his more intimate communion with God.

II.

St. Francis loved Nature. But with his love of Nature went a temperamental urgency to express the inward man in some external utterance of speech or action. As a youth his joy of life impelled him to song and the play-acting of the young city-gallants. After his conversion, he must not only bear Christ in his soul; he must bear Him also in his body. When he definitely recognized his vocation as a follower of the Crucified Reedemer, he must don a habit which, when spread out, had the form of a cross. In his realization of the mystery of our Lord's birth, he must build a Crib "so that we may in some manner gaze with our eyes upon this great mystery". So too in his conformity with our Lord, he must observe the Gospel not only in the spirit, but as literally as possible, in such way that, as was said, Umbria became as another Galilee. One may say of him that he was a born dramatist: he must "act" the Gospel-life; he could not live it otherwise. His acting was the simple expression of his living Faith, not an assumed emotion. In a word, he must give the spirit a body —so intensely human was he. This partly explains his intense devotion to the Incarnate Word of God. In Christ, God was made visible to men. So too it partly explains his great devotion to the Blessed Sacrament; for, as he wrote in his Last Testament: "We see nothing corporally of the most High God but His most holy Body and Blood which they (the priests) consecrate".

St. Francis was, as it were, thirsty for vision, even corporal or earthly vision. In his religion, his inner life was not cut

off from the visible, tangible world. This world entered into the life of his soul; it fed the sacred flame of his life in God.

Given such a character, it is evident that the Saint's inner life is written in his uttered words and in his acts, as in a book which all may read. Not that St. Francis deliberately set himself to reveal his soul to the gaze of others: he simply could not help it, being the man he was. By nature he was a poet-dramatist; but—and this is important for the understanding of Francis—he was of those who are not content to sing the epic stories of other men. Of the necessity of his being he must live the life which fired his imagination and reproduce in himself the beauty and glory of the life he sang. He must live the life; not merely tell its story. He must make his own life one with the glory of Nature and the glory of the heroes of chivalry whom he worshiped in his youthful enthusiasm.

So it came about that his first turning from the world (before he found his religious vocation) was from the world of commerce to the quest of military adventure in which he thought to realize in himself the ideals of romantic chivalry. He left the counter for the field where, as he thought, men spent themselves in deeds of endurance and valor for the sake of a cause greater than themselves and realized the glory of manhood in unselfish service and deeds worthy of a man. This quest of secular adventure came quickly to an end. He fell sick of a fever; and before he was able to take the road again, he had heard the Voice which gave a new direction to his life. But in the impulse which drove him to that military adventure, the mystical element in his character was already beginning to assert itself, impelling him to strive to realize his dreams, to find the life itself of which the poets merely sang. True, as yet he perceived the reality of life for which already his soul was a-hungered, only as it was imaged in the glory of Nature and the romance of chivalry. But such as he saw it, he wished to live in it and make it his own. He would live the poem he sang; become a freeman of the wide world where men live in a companionship with Nature and in performance of chivalric service: and incidentally escape from the counting-house and the stuffy ambitions of the money-making commercial class which strangled his soul.

That military adventure of his was but a groping in the dark. He wanted to live the life of which he had caught reflected gleams in his communion with Nature and in the romances of chivalry; and he struck out on a path which was the only one he knew.

Then came the mysterious Voice as he lay on his sick-bed to which the fever confined him: "Francis, whom is it better to serve, the Lord or the servant?" and his quick, eager recognition that he had set out on a fool's adventure, so far as the satisfaction of his soul's longing was concerned, and must retrace his steps and look deeper into the mystery of his soul. And with that recognition came his first real apprehension of the truth that the key to the mystery of life lies in the Faith and that man's true life is the Christ-life revealed in the Incarnate Son of God. Not all at once did he see clearly what it was to mean to him. At first it came to him as a conviction clouded in mystery. But it turned him back from his military adventure and set his mind groping for light in the realm of his Catholic Faith as hitherto he had sought it in the romances of chivalry. Long months passed, months of sore travail of spirit, of doubts and hesitations and renewed resolutions, before the clouds which enshrouded his new conviction parted and the first gleam of sunlight dispelled once and for all his doubts and at the same time initiated him into the new worship of life in which his thirsty soul was to find its vocation and satisfaction. It was the chance meeting with a leper as he rode one day from Foligno to Assisi. In his horror of physical deformity, Francis turned away and would have avoided the leper, when his memory stirred and the thought came to him that Christ had been described in prophecy as a reputed leper for our redemption.

Francis leaped from his horse and, taking the leper in his arms, embraced him—and in embracing the leper, embraced Christ in him: and from that moment his repugnance gave place to a worshipful compassion. It was the turning-point in his conversion: from that time he never looked back. And from that moment too all the visible world took on a new meaning to him. As he had seen Christ in the leper, so henceforth the visible world was to manifest to him not only the glory of the Creator but also the mystery and passion of the Divine

Redeemer. Suffering and misery and ignominy had now a new meaning for him, inasmuch as it now figured forth to him the great drama of the world's Redemption gathered into, and borne in the Heart of the Redeemer, who " took our iniquities upon Himself ".

The real life of Francis—of Francis the Saint—now began.

III.

At that moment of his definite conversion Francis turned his back once and for all upon the secular ambitions which had hitherto beckoned him onward. But there was one thing he retained—his natural self as his character had been formed in his love of Nature and of chivalry. Only now Nature held for him a wider and more sacred message, and Christ the Redeemer had become his Exemplar and Leader in the chivalric romance of life. It was as poet and knight-errant that Francis entered into his mystical relations with God and learned in Christ's service the Heart of Christ and the heart of the world which Christ came to save. And here lies the key to the mystical life of Francis the Saint.

To sum up briefly what may be called the theology of the mysticism of St. Francis: the Incarnate Word of God, who out of God's great love for His creatures had come amongst us, to redeem from sin and the consequences of sin, this world which was created by God to witness in created fashion to the beauty and glory of the Divine Life, as within the life of the Godhead the Eternal Word witnesses to the glory and splendor of God. The Divine Word became Incarnate amongst us, that He, " the splendor of the Father ", might reveal to us in human fashion the beauty of God's holiness in which we were originally created, and, making Himself one with us in our human nature, make atonement for our sin by bearing in Himself the consequences of our sin. Moreover, He would gather to Himself our fallen world in His Divine atonement, that as we share in His atonement we may come to share in the new life of Grace which is in Himself as the Son of God. As St. Francis would say, Christ made Himself our Brother in our suffering, that we might become His brethren in His glory. That was the great drama of life which now began to unfold itself to Francis's vision after that encounter with the leper.

What was in some way peculiar to St. Francis, was his vivid realization that the actual life of the visible world is a working out both of the consequences of sin and of the Divine Redeemer's "great adventure" for the world's rehabilitation in holiness and its reconciliation with God. He saw the visible world as the stage on which "the great adventure" of our Redemption is still being worked out in the lives of men and in the life of the world at large: a stage on which every man and every earthly creature play their parts in the battle of Redemption, either for good or ill. This visible world was —as he vividly realized it—the battle-ground where the forces of Redemption under the leadership of the Word Incarnate and in the power of His wisdom and love, were pitted against the powers of evil inspired and led by the Enemy of mankind, a battleground revealing at once the miseries wrought by sin and the triumphs of the grace of the Divine Redeemer.

The powers of evil were rampant in city feuds, party rivalries, wars, oppression of the poor, lust of wealth and all the sins which were degrading men below the level of the beast. The consequences of evil were seen in the suffering, spiritual and corporal, which was scattered over the earth—aye and even in the sufferings of the beasts and in the deformation of Nature wrought by man's selfishness or his blindness to the created beauty of God's work. For not only man, but Nature itself so far as it came under man's domination, was bearing the misery of sin: and to Francis this too was a sacrilege against the Divine Creator.

On the other hand was the Divine Redeemer calling to His side "men of good will" to work with Him for the undoing of evil, for the liberation of the world from sin and the reconstitution of the world in the beauty and holiness of God, so that life on earth might again be the novitiate of heaven instead of the nursery of hell. And the weapon of the Divine Redeemer with which He Himself was armed, and with which He would arm His followers in this warfare against evil, was none other than the Divine Love itself—love of God, love of man and love of the whole world of God's creation; love in its threefold manifestation of worship, benevolence and pity—that love which in the ideal of chivalry was the mainspring of all worthy action and the glory of the "perfect gentle knight".

In such wise did life present itself to Francis after his conversion: yet always with the poet's outlook clothing that realistic apprehension of the facts of Faith which is the mark of the true mystic.

IV.

In the mystical life of St. Francis there are two facts which stand out and control all his thought and action. The first is that of the Divine Redeemer present in the world and working to redeem it from sin and its consequences by the power of Divine love. The second fact is the beauty of life as created by God—a beauty never altogether lost even in man's fall from grace; and the sacramental character attaching to that beauty.

It is perhaps true to say that the peculiar mark of Franciscan mysticism (as derived from St. Francis) lies in the apprehension of the beauty of created life in its sacramental revelation of the Divine life. I use the term "sacramental revelation" because, in the eyes of St. Francis, Nature—God's visible creation—is not only a manifestation of the Divine life, but a communication of the Divine life to the soul of man. Whoever assimilates to himself the truth and beauty of Nature, receives into himself something of the Divine life itself, and grows into a greater fulness of the created image of God. True, because of sin, this natural sacrament is often converted into a sacrilege, bringing death instead of life. That is one of the consequences of sin from which the Redeemer would save us. But the clear recognition of the sacramental character of Nature was one of the moulding forces of St. Francis's spiritual life and a revindication of a Catholic truth which had become somewhat obscured in the centuries immediately preceding the Saint's lifetime. Non-Catholic eulogists of Francis have sometimes misunderstood this sacramental view of nature and hailed the Saint as a pantheist, whilst, amongst Catholics themselves, not a few have seen in the Saint's love of the visible creation, nothing more than a poet's delight. But with Francis the Saint, communion with Nature—the whole created world—was a real communing with God in His works; creation was to Francis a book or picture in which God not only reveals Himself but communes with His creatures,

and gives of Himself to His creatures. It was the God omnipotent imparting to the world His majesty, power and beauty, whom the Saint praised in his " Praise of all creatures ", commonly known as the " Canticle of the Sun ". Hence his reverence—almost fantastic as the uncomprehending critic deems it—for created life in all its forms; as for instance his command to his brethren that they should not entirely destroy the trees when making a clearing in the wood, but leave some shoot of each tree to sprout again into life. So too his reverence for the human will which he would guide by love rather than force " by a sergeant's arm ". Life was too sacred to be dealt with ruthlessly by the will of any man. Such ruthless dealing with any of God's creatures he regarded as a blasphemy against God, in whom and by whom all creatures live and have their being. Not unconnected with this reverence for the created world was his love of poverty—poverty as he understood it, the Lady Poverty of his dreams. The beauty of poverty in the eyes of Francis lay in this, that it brought men into closer relation with Nature itself as against the artificial life built up by wealth, with its class-distinctions, its unwholesome luxury, and its narrowing appreciation of the Creator's gifts in favor of the things of one's own making. " Holy Poverty ", he once said, " leads a man to the gates of heaven ". He was referring to that poverty which, having freed a man from the artificialties and luxuries created by wealth, brings him into touch with the more elemental things of life and teaches him, as it taught Francis himself, the sacramental character of the life of God's creation: thus preparing him to enter into the more intimate communion with God in the mysteries of Divine Faith. For the same reason, too, that he fled from the artificial life created by wealth, he revolted against that " acquired knowledge of the schools " which (as was but too evident in the universities and schools of his day) leads to pedantry and that intellectualism which " dehumanizes " the mind and cuts men adrift from the natural sympathies which bind the world together. For to Francis simplicity of mind and character went hand-in-hand with poverty. In poverty and simplicity he found that communion with God in the visible world which made earth and sky and all therein so sacred in his eyes.

It was this vivid realization of the visible creation as the created "splendor of the Father's glory", bequeathed by Francis to his followers, which disposed Franciscan theologians to the theory that the Incarnation of the Eternal Word of God was decreed in the very act of creation as the crowning glory of the visible universe. The very sacredness of the creation seemed to them a call for that close personal union of the created "splendor of God" with the uncreated "Splendor of the Father" in the life of the Word Incarnate. In this personal union decreed from eternity they saw the consummation of God's love for His creation and of creation's desire for union with God.

Yet this sacramental view of the visible creation entered and coalesced with Francis's view of the actual world as the battle-ground of the world's Redemption, with the Divine Redeemer as the central Figure. In the vision of Francis, the Redeemer of the world was "the great King" giving battle to regain His rightful inheritance and win back from the powers of evil the world which was created in His own image and likeness to be His copartner in manifesting the glory of God.

V.

To understand the exquisite pathos of the adoring love of St. Francis for Jesus Crucified, one has to remember the romance of chivalry in which the mind of the Saint had been steeped in his youth and which remained throughout his life the mould in which his thought was cast.

In his eyes this visible world of ours was as the distressed maiden, despoiled of her rights, whom "the gentle knight", the Eternal Word of God, had come to succor and reinstate and to wed in everlasting love. In the Incarnation the Eternal Word had plighted His mystical vow with the visible creation and taken upon Himself to reinstate human nature and the world of man as the created image and glory of the Divine life. The thought, of course, is not new: it is the same thought that runs through St. John's Gospel and the Pauline Epistles and is found in the prayer of the Mass at the blessing of the water about to be put into the chalice. In other words it is the Catholic doctrine of the Redemption: but realized by Francis in the psychological setting of the chivalric romance.

But the special note of the mysticism of St. Francis is that, just as he brought all the visible world into his relation with God, so too he vividly apprehended the whole of creation, in so far as it comes under the control of man's will, as the actual battleground of the contest between God's redeeming love and the powers of evil. To him the whole of the world's actual life is absorbed into this great contest; and in the midst of this contest he saw Christ the Redeemer, by the miracle of Divine love, bearing in Himself the brunt of the contest, gathering to Himself the world's sorrow, and imparting the grace of a new life restored in the holiness of God.

Thus it was that to Francis all suffering—not only the suffering of men, but the suffering of animal life and even the deformities of the inanimate creation wrought by the will of man—was a real participation in the suffering of the Divine Redeemer, who bore the world's suffering in His Heart, because of His love for the world He created: or to put it in another way, in all suffering Francis saw the Divine Redeemer suffering in the great mystery of His love. It was no mere sentiment of the imagination which made him see Christ in the leper or shrink with horror from any brutal treatment of the beasts: but the vivid realization that the leper's suffering and even the suffering of the ill-treated animal was part of the suffering of the Divine Redeemer in His mystic union of love with His creation. In his compassion for the suffering world, Francis at one and the same moment compassionated with the suffering before his eyes, and with the suffering Redeemer who had taken all suffering into His suffering love for the world. It was Christ in his fellow creatures and his fellow creatures in Christ, upon whom Francis poured out the vast pity of his heart as he went about his apostolate of love and mercy. He never looked upon the Divine Redeemer apart from the actual suffering in the world; nor beheld the world's suffering apart from the Redeemer. The words of our Lord: "Inasmuch as ye have done unto one of the least of these my brethren, you have done unto me," were significant to Francis of the mystic bond uniting our Lord to the suffering world, and of our Lord's assumption to Himself of all the suffering in the world He came to restore—even, let me repeat, of the suffering of the beasts caused by the insensitiveness or brutality

of man, and the wanton deformation of the inanimate creation, since these too are consequences of man's fall from grace.

Thus did the Saint see in our Divine Redeemer Him who "took upon Himself our iniquities"; the Man of (the world's) sorrows: but also to the Saint's vivid Faith, the Manifestation and Exemplar of the Divine love by which alone our wounds are healed.

And the practical lesson he drew from his mystic Faith was this, that only as men are transformed into the image of that Divine suffering love manifested in the Divine Redeemer, can they take to themselves the Redemption won for us by Christ in the mystery of His own Sacred Humanity, and work together with Him for the world's Redemption.

Divine love as manifested in Christ, with its threefold activity of worship, benevolence and pity, was, as Francis understood it, the Divine law of life by which the world is restored to God. It moulded all his relations with God and men and the visible world: it underlay the form of life in which he clothed the aspirations of his soul—the poverty he wedded as his bride, and the apostolate in which he served under the banner of the Redeemer.

As its most exquisite expression, this love was manifested in Francis in the spirit of worship (the root of his amazing humility). It shines luminously in "the lover's love" with which he sought spiritual union with his Crucified Lord and which made him live but to reproduce in himself His Lord's image to His Lord's glory. Hardly less luminously does it give a halo to the marked reverence of his relations with his fellow men, his companionship with all living things and his vast wonder at the beauty of earth and sky. His whole being was steeped in worship; and for that reason it was that the visible world, both in its beauty and its suffering, was to him a revelation of the life of God and of God's purpose in the world. For he had the worshipful vision which alone can see God whether in heaven or on earth.

With this spirit of worship went that "obedience of charity" —as he expressed it—which made him the free servant of all, of God and man, serving for love and not for gain; that in this service he might realize his fellowship with Christ and

man and all the world and in his fellowship attain to union with God, the Divine Source of love.

And of his vast pity, what need be said?—a pity which embraced all suffering and took it to himself in love, even as did Christ his Lord whose humble follower he was.

So St. Francis looked into the mystery of life, and in his eyes was the vision of the Divine Redeemer come into the world to regain His own, the kingdom which was His by eternal design. He looked with this vision in his eyes and saw the lingering beauty of the world in which it was created, and saw too the beauty of suffering inspired with love by which sin is atoned for and the world restored to grace. But when he turned his gaze upon the Divine Redeemer and saw in Him the Word Incarnate driven by love to take upon Himself the burden of the world He loved, then there was but one prayer in the heart of Francis, that in his own measure he might share the burden of the Divine Redeemer and know the pain and the joy of Love Crucified.

FR. CUTHBERT, O.S.F.C.

Assisi, Italy.

MARRIAGE CASES DECIDED BY THE ROTA IN 1931.

Some Interesting Side-Lights.

IN the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, issue of 5 March, 1932, pp. 84-96, the Roman Rota again publishes a summary of the cases it has tried during the year 1931. Of the sixty-two (62) decisions, fifty-six (56) were given in marriage cases.

Owing to the summary manner in which the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* lists these decisions, it is in some cases (where two or more grounds are mentioned as the basis of the plea) difficult to determine the extent to which each reason contributed to the decision. Yet knowledge of that would be desirable, since for a favorable decision it is not necessary that both be proved: it suffices that only one be established. The following notes to the table will call attention to these and other peculiar cases.

The grounds which underlay the pleas on which they were entered and the decisions in each class were distributed as follows:

Pleas	*Favorable*	*Unfavorable*
Intention excluding offspring	2[1]	6[2]
Violence and fear	13	13[3,4,5,6,10]
Lack of mandate for proxy	1	0
Condition[7]	1	2
Clandestinity	3[11]	2[8]
Insanity	1	0
Feigned consent	2[11]	9[4,6]
Impotence	1	3[9]
Non-consummation	1[9]	1[10]
Intention contrary to indissolubility	1[1]	2[2]

The following numbered paragraphs refer to the superior figures in the foregoing table:

1. Case XXXIV was based on two grounds: intention contrary to the indissolubility of marriage and to offspring.

2. Case XVI was raised "ex capite defectus consensus ob exclusum bonum prolis." While this might appear to be a double ground, it is actually only one, viz. an intention excluding offspring.

3. Case XVI was entered on the double plea of fear and of an intention excluding indissolubility. But neither was proved.

4. Case XXVII, entered on the plea of force and fear, was decided in the negative, 7 December, 1929 ("S. R. Rota, causae ... actae 1929 ...", LXIV—*Acta Ap. Sedis*, XXII [1930], 190); last year it seems to have been examined rather on the plea of defect of consent. But was again decided unfavorably.

5. Dec. XXXIII decided only the incidental question whether this case, introduced on the plea of force and fear, should be admitted to another trial, which was refused. It is not stated what the previous decision was, but it is very probable that it was unfavorable, as it is listed above.

6. The plea in case XLIX was based on fictitious consent and coercion, neither of which was proved, as the decision was unfavorable.

7. Cases LVIII (decided favorably) and XXXVII and XXXIX (decided unfavorably) were pleaded "ex capite conditionis appositae" without stating wherein the condition consisted. Was it either "contra bonum prolis" or "contra bonum sacramenti", or some other? We have at present no way of determining this point.

8. Case XXVIII is stated as entered on the plea of lack of the substantial form (of the decree *Ne temere* or canon 1094); above it is listed under the former equivalent, "clandestinity".

9. One case entered on the plea of impotence (n. XVII) presents a strange situation. This case in both the first instance (before a diocesan court, 10 July, 1919) and in the second (before the Rota, 29 July, 1920) was tried on the plea of impotence on the part of the man and decided favorably, the marriage being declared invalid; that earlier sentence of the Rota was final. (Cf. *S. Romanae Rotae Decisiones seu Sententiae*, vol. XII, dec. XXIII.) Now the case was tried again and the previous declaration of nullity was reversed, but the marriage in question was declared never to have been consummated. What is at the bottom of this reversal of the Rota's earlier decision? Probably the man later actually had intercourse with another woman than the one he had first married and perhaps procreated children. If this is true, then it is evident that the man was not permanently impotent and, despite the earlier two conformable decisions, the man's first marriage was valid: he and his wife remained united in the bond of that marriage. If, then, on the strength of those two earlier conformable decisions either the husband or the wife had contracted marriage (in good faith) with a third person, this latter marriage was invalid on account of the pre-existing bond of that valid marriage. This case illustrates the principle laid down in canon 1903 that questions regarding the state of a person never become absolutely settled ("nunquam transeunt in rem iudicatam"): the double conformable sentence prevents the reöpening of the case unless new and important evidence or documents be presented. And so long as such new proof is not forthcoming, the parties can, both in the external and (with due regard for certain exceptional circumstances) in the internal forum, with a clear conscience proceed to act upon those decisions; in a marriage case, such as this, they can lawfully enter upon a new marriage. If then later this new marriage is discovered actually to have been invalid, it must be considered "putative" (cf. canon 1015 § 4), and any children born of this "putative" marriage are in the eyes of canon law legitimate (canon 1114). The proof of non-consummation of this man's earlier marriage opened

the way to a dispensation "super rato et non consummato", which would then permit of the convalidation of a marriage which he or his first wife may have contracted in the interim.

10. In case XLVII neither force and fear nor non-consummation was established.

11. In case LV the marriage, which was declared invalid, was attacked on the two pleas of clandestinity and lack of consent; but it is for the present impossible to determine whether both or only one of the pleas, and if the latter, which one was proved.

This list of cases decided by the Rota presents occasion to discuss several other interesting points. The number of marriage cases tried by the Rota during the year 1931, in all fifty-six, is indeed very small, since they came from every part of the globe with a Catholic population of more than 250,000,000.[1]

One must not, however, minimize this proportion; for the list represents only those cases which were decided by the Rota, usually upon appeal from diocesan matrimonial courts. There are more cases decided finally in metropolitan or other courts of appeal. It is seen, then, that the total is not nearly so large as non-Catholics seem to suppose.

As has happened during the past several years, the declarations of nullity (24 or 42$\frac{8}{7}$%) were again exceeded by the unfavorable decisions (32 or 57$\frac{1}{7}$%).

Then, too, the largest class was again that of cases based on force and fear, twenty-six, of which exactly half were decided favorably and half unfavorably, if the refusal to review one previously decided case, is counted as unfavorable.[2]

In eight cases the plea was based on an intention excluding offspring ("contra bonum prolis"), but only two were decided favorably. And of these two, one (XXXIV) was entered on a double plea, "ex capite intentionis contra bonum Sacramenti

[1] Moreover, eleven of the cases had been previously decided by the Rota, but not during the year 1931, so that none of them occurs twice in the recent list, though they did occur in earlier lists. This actually reduces the total of different marriages examined by the Rota. In two of these eleven cases (XXIII and XXVI) the previous declaration of nullity was confirmed, whereas in one (XVII) it was reversed. In five cases (XXVII, XXXVII, XLVII, LIII, LX), the earlier unfavorable decision was sustained, whereas in two (IV and XLII) it was reversed.

[2] See note 5 to table.

et contra bonum prolis"; the former—a mere reserving of the right of divorce—more easily invalidates a marriage than does the latter; and it was perhaps rather on that plea than on this that the case in question was decided. These cases which only recently have begun to figure somewhat prominently before the Rota seem to betray a propensity on the part of some to exaggerate the bearing of an intention "contra bonum prolis" on the validity of the marriage. On the other hand, the unfavorable decisions (in six out of the eight cases) seem to confirm what has previously been maintained in the "Conferences" of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, viz. that pre-nuptial agreements to exclude any children whatsoever or to limit their number must not too hastily be considered as excluding the "ius ad coniugalem actum" (can. 1086 § 2), and therefore as invalidating the marriage. At any rate it reveals the difficulty of satisfactorily proving the intention to exclude that right.

Canon 1089 permits marriage by proxy, but lays down very stringent rules for the empowering of the proxy. A failure to fulfill these requirements has resulted in the declaration of nullity of one marriage (IV) on this very rare plea.

Besides these cases, the same number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* contains another list of cases which for one reason or another have been closed without coming to trial. Among them are twenty marriage cases. In a few of these cases one of the parties had in the meantime died, so that there was no longer any reason to examine the marriage (canon 1972); a few others concerned questions merely incidental to a trial; in most of the cases the plaintiff had failed to take any action for over a year, with the result that he lost his right to prosecute the case (canon 1736). A special interest revolves about three cases: these had been appealed to the Rota by the *defensor vinculi* of some diocesan court, despite the fact that two conformable sentences had already been passed declaring the marriage invalid. For after examining the acts in these three cases the *defensor vinculi* of the Rota found it unnecessary to press the cases for further trial and so informed the judge of the Rota, who declared the case closed and the parties free to contract another marriage. Here are cases in which the defender of the bond betrayed too great zeal. Canon 1987

does not ordinarily oblige the *defensor vinculi* to appeal after two conformable decisions for the invalidity of the marriage, even if besides those two decisions one or more for the validity had been passed: only when he believes that there is good reason for the appeal must he make it.

In recent years the Rota has not indicated the cases in which the parties were relieved of paying all or part of the costs of the trial; it states merely in which cases it obliged one of its lawyers to represent the plaintiff gratis. No doubt at least in these cases the parties were excused from paying the costs of the trial. There were twenty-three [3] such cases, and again in the majority (12) the result was favorable.

Even the brief summary of the decisions which the Rota has published is another proof of the Church's zeal in upholding that indissolubility of consummated marriage between the faithful, while at the same time she safeguards the freedom of those not bound by valid marriage. For she is undaunted in taking up the investigation of such cases in the face of the false, if not malicious, reproach that her declarations of nullity are but a scheme to circumvent her doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage.

VALENTINE SCHAAF, O.F.M.
The Catholic University of America.

THE CONFRATERNITY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE AT WORK.—II.

The Santa Fe Archdiocesan Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

The Archdiocese of Santa Fe is one of the largest in territorial extent, covering 104,168 square miles.[20] The number of Catholics listed is 147,694.

The "Religious Instruction Survey" [21] of the N. C. W. C. reports that there is an attendance of 3,057 children from the public schools for catechetical instruction which is given by Religious Communities of Sisters.

In 1922, a new Religious Community known as the Society of Missionary Catechists of Our Blessed Lady of Victory, with

[3] Only eighteen (18) are mentioned in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 5 March, 1932; but in the issue of 1 April, 1932, in footnote on page 130, five more are added.

[20] *Official Catholic Directory*, 1932, Archdiocese of Santa Fe.

[21] Cf. *Religious Instruction Report*, N.C.W.C., 1931, p. 28.

headquarters at Huntington, Indiana, was formed to give catechetical instruction in the mission districts. The Reverend J. J. Sigstein is the present Spiritual Director. To aid these women Catechists in reaching the out-of-the-way mission places, young women from 16 to 20 years in age, who are natives of these places, are instructed by the Catechists.

The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine was formed on a parish basis in 1927 in the Diocese.[22] As soon as one pastor has been provided with a sufficient number of trained workers, the training of lay catechists in an adjoining parish begins. The Confraternity is laboring in six or seven parishes in remote mountain villages which are not accessible during the rainy and snowy seasons. During such times the work of instructing the children is carried on by the lay catechist. The meeting place is the mission chapel or rural school. The classes are taught by one to three lay catechists. The number of Catholic children who are being reached by the Confraternity is approximately 700. One fourth of the fifty-two teaching members of the Confraternity are public school teachers. In view of their experience, the school teachers are not required to take the regular catechetical course. This consists of eight weeks instruction in catechetics and is given by the Missionary Catechists of Our Lady of Victory. At the invitation of the pastor, two Missionary Catechists go to the parish to conduct this institute for lay catechists. The group of young women attending is limited to from twelve to sixteen in number. They come from great distances; board and room is provided during the time of the course; no charge is made but the young students help meet expenses by contributing whatever they can of their branch produce. Since the members labor under the patronage of Our Blessed Lady of Victory, they are enrolled in the Confraternity before the altar of Our Lady with the parish priest officiating. At the end of the course and enrollment these lay catechists return to their native villages to work as leaders among their own.

In the monthly "Missionary Catechist", the Reverend Supervisor[23] described one of these catechetical institutes for us as follows:

[22] Cf. Catechist Blanche Richardson, "Holding our Missions to the Faith" (of Victory-Mount, Las Vegas, New Mexico), *The Acolyte*, Vol. 8, No. 7, 2 April, 1932, p. 9810.

[23] Catechist Blanche Richardson, "Catechism-Teachers' Training Camps in

In the summer of 1929 the first "Catechism-Teachers' Training Camp" was opened at Chaperito, New Mexico, with thirteen 'recruits' in attendance. The girls came from as many as seven mission villages, all within the confines of the Chaperito parish, yet varying in distances of from forty to sixty-five miles from each other. Needless to say, accommodations for eating and sleeping during the eight weeks of this intensive training were indispensable. A four-room abode house was provided by the pastor. Generous friends in the East provided the camp furnishings, which consisted of cots, camp-chairs, folding card tables to be used as school desks, and other essential school-room equipment. The girls themselves partly bore the burden of the grocery bill by bringing with them bags of beans, strings of chili, eggs and strips of dried meat.

The various studies pursued were Christian Doctrine, Bible History, Liturgy, the principles of Christian pedagogy, hymn-singing and sewing. Sewing classes included instruction in the making of smaller altar linens. In addition, organ lessons were given. For this purpose four organs were brought in from mission chapels fifteen and twenty miles distant.

The purpose [24] of such institutes is not only to give necessary instruction but to develop a more dependable body of workers. Ordinary meetings as in other dioceses are here rendered impossible due to the scattered rural population. As Catechist Blanche Richardson writes:

The parishioners, having their own village chapels where Mass is celebrated but three or four times a year, are unacquainted with persons residing at a distant village in the same parish. The pastor himself has never seen all, nor even half, of his people together at one place at one time. Hence no organizer or Christian Doctrine teachers could ever hope to reach interested and future lay workers by calling a general meeting at one point of the parish.

These lay catechists do not limit themselves to their respective villages but go out to the neighboring places for the children. An instance is cited of one village notorious for its neglect of religious duties, as the Catechist [25] writer relates:

New Mexico", in the *Missionary Catechist,* Vol. VII, April, 1931, No. 5, p. 3. Missionary Catechist Publishing Co., Rev. J. J. Sigstein (Editor), Huntington, Ind.

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

It was an unusual thing for anyone to make his First Holy Communion until the occasion of his seeking a partner in matrimony when, of course, it was obligatory first to be prepared properly to receive this Sacrament of the Living.

Needless to say, the village is now in the Confraternity's care. Another incident is given that affords a glimpse of heroism of these young lay catechists: [26]

For months one lay catechist conducted devotions daily in the little mission chapel in the absence of the Missionary. She led the congregation in the recitation of the Rosary, parts of which were sung, and in the morning and evening prayers recited in community. The cold weather and small supply of fuel for heating the church obliged this little missionary of fourteen (she was our youngest pupil) to abandon her efforts temporarily; but she intends to resume them when the weather is warmer.

The Missionary Catechists encourage these youthful and zealous workers by frequent visits. Although the lay catechists are almost without exception very poor, they have never asked for anything for themselves, only for the children under their care. They are very happy to get holy pictures, medals, etc., to distribute among their little charges. As zealous and efficient auxiliaries of the Missionary Catechists, these young lay workers are rendering heroic service in preserving the Faith of their own poor people living in the scattered out-Missions of New Mexico.

Three institutes have been held so far in different towns.[27] One must remember that in this Archdiocese, distances are considerable; one parish may embrace a whole county with a dozen or more towns. Hence the need of a center to train the catechists from remote points. The first institute cost around $250; the second, $500; this addition was due to expense of shipping supplies from Las Vegas, 250 miles away; a third, $300. The expense is met through the Society of Missionary Catechists, which depends on the generous support of interested friends.[28]

In summary, then, some 700 children in remote and scattered villages are being reached through the Confraternity

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] N. B. In 1929, in the Chaperito Parish; in 1930, in the Abeytas Parish; in 1931, in the Mosquero Parish.

[28] From private correspondence to the writer from the Diocesan Supervisor, 1932.

workers, religious and lay, in the Archdiocese of Santa Fe. The Missionary Catechists of Our Lady of Victory are the chief workers in this cause; they prepare lay catechists in a special eight-weeks catechetical course to carry the work on in their native villages.

In the Monterey-Fresno Diocese (California).

On the Western Coast is the recently-formed Monterey-Fresno Diocese covering 43,714 square miles [29] and having a Catholic population of some 80,000 according to the present Directory. The "Religious Instruction Report" [30] of the N. C. W. C. gives the following information about the Diocese:

Sunday Schools, religious vacation schools and week-day classes are provided in parishes with and without parochial schools.

Because of the rural nature of this diocese the religious instruction problem facing the Bishop upon his installation as the first Bishop in 1924 was enormous. He has solved it to date by the erection of parochial schools in most parishes which can afford them and by the placing, in five widely separated centers of the diocese, four religious communities devoted entirely to catechetical work. These are the Sisters of the Holy Family, the Missionary Catechists (two foundations), the Sisters of the Atonement and the Mexican Sisters of the Compañia de Maria. In addition, the teaching communities are encouraged to take catechetical work on afternoons and Saturdays. An active Confraternity of Christian Doctrine has been functioning for four years, assisting the Sisters and in many cases maintaining separate centers of instruction. A completely equipped Chapel car travels through the fruit camps and mining districts of the diocese, the chaplain giving instructions and preparing young and old for the Sacraments.

The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine was started here [31] in September 1927, when eight young women met at the Holy Family Convent in Fresno to begin the work. Volunteers are now recruited chiefly through the Catholic schools. The members of the Confraternity are not allowed to take up regular teaching until a year's instruction has been completed; such courses are given every second week during the school year.

[29] *Official Catholic Directory,* 1932, Monterey-Fresno Diocese (Summary).
[30] *Religious Instruction Report,* N. C. W. C., 1931, 41.
[31] Very Rev. Msgr. John L. Crowley, Report given to writer, 1932.

Graded certificates are awarded according to the completion of the first year's course, the second and third. It is worth noting that five members of the Fresno Confraternity have since entered the religious teaching communities. Although the courses are given to prospective teachers of the Confraternity, others have attended the evening lecture classes during the school year. The subjects treated were the Commandments (1927-28); the Sacraments (1928-29); the Mass (1929-30).

In conjunction with the Sisters of the Holy Family, whose primary work is the teaching of religion, the Confraternity[32] has arranged retreats for the Catholic women. The lay members of the Confraternity assist the Sisters in establishing missionary centers and when possible, some of the centers are turned over to the permanent care of the Sisters. The Confraternity reaches throughout the school year about 500 children with an average of 200 in the summer classes. In summary, the Confraternity work, started in 1927 by laywomen in coöperation with the Sisters of the Holy Family, is gradually spreading throughout this rural diocese with the assistance of four religious communities devoted to catechetical work. His Excellency, Bishop McGinley, has directed that the Confraternity be established in every parish in the diocese; where parishes wish to group themselves for a Confraternity, a branch Confraternity is to be opened in each of such groups. This latter plan has been followed in the city of Fresno.

The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in the Diocese of Great Falls, Montana.

The first pastoral letter of His Excellency,[33] Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara of Great Falls prescribed that the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine should be established in every parish and mission of his diocese under the patronage of the Christ Child among the Doctors. In this Diocese[34] of 94,158 square miles there is a Catholic population of 27,585.

Over a hundred parishes and missions were without the services of the Sisterhoods or Brotherhoods in teaching religion

[32] N. B. The following are the Confraternity Centers at present: Fresno, Clovis, Reedley, Selma, Fowler, Kerman, Riverdale, Del Ray, Squaw Valley, Sanger, Clovis, Lemoore, Hanford.

[33] First Sunday of Advent, 1930. Cf. *The Acolyte*, II, No. 13, p. 7ff, 25, July, 1931.

[34] *Official Catholic Directory*, 1932, Summary.

to the children. The first task of the Great Falls Confraternity was to prepare for the Religious Vacation School, a movement which his Excellency, while Director of the Rural Life Conference, promoted and which has grown until at present it is established in nearly every diocese. The plan of organization of the Confraternity here is similar to the Los Angeles-San Diego system. It has been outlined in the *Manual of Religious Vacation Schools.*[35] A second pastoral letter gave general and specific recommendations in carrying out the program of Religious Vacation Schools as well as the follow-up duties of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

The members who volunteer are grouped according to their respective duties, teachers, home visitors, distributors of literature and helpers. Training classes for teachers and other members are held from February 1 to Pentecost Sunday,[36] or from Lent until June 1.[37] The classes [38] are held at least twice a month; diplomas for faithful preparation are distributed by the Bishop.

According to the directions given by Bishop O'Hara [39] in his first pastoral, the Confraternity is not to be identified with any other society, although there is need of securing help from other Catholic societies to carry on this work. A membership of a few zealous Catholics (two or three in a small mission, ten or fifteen in a parish), is to be preferred to a large nominal membership. The parish and Mission Confraternities become affiliated with the Diocesan Confraternity and with the Arch-Confraternity in Rome when the Secretary enters the names of the local members on the membership roll. By being thus enrolled the members may partake of the indulgences granted the Confraternity.

The Most Reverend George J. Finnigan, C.S.C., set up the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, based on the Great Falls plan, in the Diocese of Helena, Montana, New Year's Day,

[35] *Manual of Religious Vacation Schools,* Rural Life Bureau, N.C.W.C., Washington, D. C., 1932 Edition, p. 93ff.

[36] First Pastoral, 1930.

[37] *Religious Vacation School Manual,* 1932, p. 94.

[38] N. B. Sullivan's *The Visible Church* (Kenedy & Sons, N. Y.), was the text chosen for 1930-31; also the *Religious Vacation School Manual,* Rural Life Bureau, N.C.W.C.

[39] Most Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, Pastoral Letter of Advent, 1930.

1932. At present, Miss Miriam Marks, a graduate of the Social Service School of the N. C. W. C., who is well experienced in the work of the Confraternity, is aiding the development in Helena. Bishop Finnigan[40] sums up the general purposes of the organization as follows in the constitution:[41]

ARTICLE II.

The objects of this organization shall be

Sec. 1. To provide religious instruction for Catholic children attending the public schools, and for boys and girls over school age, especially through the Religious Vacation School and on Sundays throughout the year.

Sec. 2. To carry out the following program in missions on Sundays when the priest is not present to say Mass:

Recitation of the Rosary and Litany.
Congregational singing of hymns.
Reading and explanation of the Epistle and Gospel of the day.
Sunday School for Children.
Study of the Mass or Liturgy for adults.

Sec. 3. To maintain at the church or assembly hall a bookrack containing inexpensive pamphlets on Catholic doctrine and teachings. A committee shall be appointed to promote the same.

Sec. 4. To promote distribution of the *Catholic Register*, Western Montana edition.

Sec. 5. To promote correspondence courses in Christian Doctrine.

In order to carry out these general purposes the members shall

1. Assist Pastors and Sisters in catechetical work;
2. See that persons are enlisted for this work, both to teach the classes and to visit the homes.
3. Encourage the formation of clubs or societies in order to provide instruction and wholesome recreation for the older boys and girls.
4. Provide a means for training the teachers.

With this brief description of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine as it functions in the dioceses selected, we may con-

[40] Most Rev. George J. Finnigan, C.SC., Pastoral Letter, Jan., 1932, Helena, Mont. This diocese of over 51,000 square miles has a Catholic population of over 42,000. Cf. *Official Catholic Directory*, 1932.

[41] Leaflet, Constitution of C.C.D., Helena, Mont.

clude that although the work of the Confraternity is similar in all these places, the organization is able to adapt itself to various local conditions and needs in carrying on its missionary and catechetical program.

RAYMOND J. G. PRINDIVILLE, C.S.P.

San Francisco, California.

A POINT OF VIEW IN PREACHING.

The Blessed Sacrament.

THE preacher who is a thoughtful observer of life will have frequent occasions to notice that many are inclined to look upon this or that doctrine of Faith simply as an element in the teaching of the Church, to be learned and known in an isolated way. Lacking habits of analysis, impressed by ordinary experiences of life and adjusted to the routine of Catholic practice, such persons may live good lives and enjoy a quiet comfortable conscience. They will hear sermons and instructions and even profit by them, while failing to grasp spiritual truths and to make of them a power for greater righteousness, elements of new spiritual vision. There are many truths of divine revelation that are speculative. Knowledge of them is necessary to the integrity of Faith, but that understanding does not necessarily lead to any change in behavior. The Holy Trinity, the Hypostatic Union, the human knowledge of Christ invite the devout attention of the theologian, and the believing mind is attracted to them strongly as elements in divine revelation. But learned discussion of them may leave the hearer unmoved unless they are in some practical way brought to bear directly on one's manner of living. The happy action of divine grace and the devotion of faithful hearts can do much to spiritualize life, while technical understanding of some truths of Faith lags far behind. It is better to feel compunction than to know its definition.

There are many truths of divine revelation, however, that are practical and immediate. They demand assent and obedience because they do affect thought and behavior. They have direct bearing on the daily life of the believer. Sin,

temptation, prayer, duties, service, forgiveness, penance are not and cannot be merely speculative. Understanding of them is imperative. Sermons devoted to them should never leave the hearer unmoved. He should feel an elementary and specific obligation to conquer sin, to cherish foresight against temptation and to bring all of his power to the faithful performance of duty as it is explained. There are, however, many speculative aspects of such truths that invite study, but mastery of them, desirable as it is, is not a condition to worthy living. One can pray for grace and thank God fervently for it, without knowing anything about the controversies that have appeared in theological literature. One can approach the sacraments reverently and unto abiding spiritual profit, without analytical study of matter and form and without interest in their history. And it is well for most of us that this is the case. The intellectual approach to piety is very much unlike the devotional approach. Knowledge and understanding are sources of strength and spiritual growth. But they are conditioned by capacity and opportunity of instruction. Piety is conditioned by love of God and that love comes within the competence of all who have the use of reason and the gift of Faith. "Facienti quod in se est, Deus non denegat gratiam."

If these principles are true within their obvious limits, may the preacher not be guided by them from time to time in preparing sermons? He may well take it for granted that in the ordinary course of Catholic life, as home, school, association and sermon affect it, a fairly wide course of instruction has been received by the faithful. Any sermon preached is but one detail in the process of Catholic training. The prescribed cycle of instruction found in many dioceses provides for the intellectual needs of the people by intention at least, if not in fact. There is room, therefore, for sermons that have as their direct object, not formal instruction as such, but rather an emotional appeal that will stimulate piety and win souls to deeper devotion.

One method of preaching on the Blessed Sacrament without taking up the doctrine formally, is here suggested for what it may be worth. The preacher has the advantage of knowing that the Real Presence is lovingly believed in by the people and that their Holy Communions are established sources of

strength. His purpose for the moment may be to help them to profit more happily by the intimate relations between Christ and the soul made possible by the Blessed Sacrament. The appeal to be made will take the form of answer to the simple question: What has the Blessed Sacrament done for your spiritual life and character? The question may seem commonplace. An adequate answer, however, will contain a profound revelation of one's deeper life. Even an inadequate answer ought to bring a new point of view forward and stir one to determined effort to make life Eucharistic.

I.

Theoretically every life is worthy of a biography. Although we write lives of only outstanding persons, each life is a series of wonders. It is an arena where the divine plan is matured and forces of good and evil meet in conflict. God's plenary attention is directed toward it, for the soul is immortal and as such it is the object of a loving providence and favoring grace. No human life is cheap or commonplace or fails to be wonderful to one who is qualified to understand it. Every life is the outcome of the interplay of many factors. Heredity, race, family, associations, education in general and teachers in particular, environment, temperament, native ability, opportunity, accident and religion are forces that leave their traces widespread in us and it is through them that personality emerges and the will rises to ascendancy in character. Any thoroughgoing biography of an outstanding man will seek all such factors and rate them in accounting for him and his achievement. Very much of the work in modern psychology and in advancing educational practice is directed toward an evaluation of the factors, like those mentioned, that lie behind the character of every person whose training and problems engage serious attention.

May we not apply this method in answering the question: In what way is the Blessed Sacrament an actual factor in the life of a Catholic? The receiving of our Divine Lord in Holy Communion is a tremendous experience. Can one go through it and remain unaffected? If Christ intended it as the pledge of eternal life, as the source of power and holiness, can he who comes so near to Him and in such an intimate and amazing

manner, remain as he was, or he would have been, had our Lord's abiding love not given us this means of sanctification? They who receive Holy Communion may well ask themselves: In what way am I different? What has the Blessed Sacrament contributed to my life? What biography of a Catholic can be complete without an inquiry as to the contribution made to his life by Holy Communion? What could do more to stimulate appreciation of it and conquer routine and indifference than the habit of studying the effect of our Lord's presence? A refreshing new point of view may thus be established and the effect of it on piety and life ought to be marked.

Of course, such an inquiry can be overdone easily. Just as in any biography, one is often at a loss to locate and judge forces in life, one can be at a loss in evaluating the factors in spiritual life. It is not easy when writing from a general standpoint, to be accurate. Nor need that be intended. The knowledge of what Holy Communion means in any life is reserved to it and even then one can with difficulty separate Holy Communion out from all of the channels of grace that the Mercy of God employs. But when a preacher sets forth the thought here offered in a simple and effective way, he will probably accomplish much that will be hidden from him. Many hearers will discover that they have unconsciously protected innocence throughout a lifetime by supreme fidelity to Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. They will have done, all unknowing, what a noble layman once said to the writer, "I live from one Communion to another." Such persons see life lit by the beauty of a rainbow whose ends rest on two Communions—the first in innocent childhood, and the last, to which they look forward with quiet content, as Viaticum. They have dwelt with God and His beauty and scarcely realized it.

Other hearers will discover that Holy Communion has redeemed them from sin, given hope to their sorrow and compensation to their restored loyalty. In their superficial way they may have thought of many things as factors in this spiritual recovery. But there will be those who owe it primarily to the intimate appeal of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament and to the awe with which they recoiled from the subtle allurements of evil when brought definitely so near to the source of sanctity in the Blessed Eucharist. It is easy to remove doctrines from

the scope of immediate concern amidst the distraction of life. But when the heart realizes what Holy Communion is and feels the touch with the Personality of Christ that it assures, it must be a hard heart that can resist the wistful appeal of the Eucharist and turn from the Divine Presence to follow the ways of sin.

There will be those who have found courage to face disaster, patience to bear with pain, self-control to curb ambition, wisdom to crush resentment, and the humility that serves justice, through deep personal devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, without having adverted to it in any way. Communions are scattered across their days. Piety has flourished, aspiration has been cherished and contentment achieved. But many will not have thought or cared to analyze the history or locate the Blessed Sacrament in it as a mighty factor.

There will be those whose apathy toward the Blessed Sacrament resulted in routine Communions, indifferent prayers and compromise with laziness and distraction. When attention is directed to the rôle of Holy Communion in their lives they will be brought face to face with a culpable neglect that will be dark and indefensible, viewed in the light of the sacramental presence of Christ.

Those who may have been guilty of sacrilege will with difficulty be brought to face the truth. The biography of such a Catholic, could it be written, would show spiritual devastation, an abandon that is but the shipwreck of hope and the nullification of grace. One may well wonder at the gradual or impulsive surrender of reverences once deeply rooted in Faith and strengthened by habit and love, involved in an unworthy Communion in which one is guilty " of the Body and Blood of Christ ". Can such a collapse be without consequences in one's inner life? And can such an experience remain of no consequence in the history of a soul? Were one able to penetrate into the mysteries of the heart, would one not find definite results from it that are features of one's spiritual biography not to be overlooked?

If the preacher undertakes to offer this interpretation of the relation of the Blessed Sacrament to actual living, he will do well to be on his guard against mistakes. It is by no means easy for any of us to understand ourselves. Still less easy

is it to penetrate into the lives of others and read them accurately. The faults that we notice, particularly among those who receive Holy Communion frequently, may be but momentary lapses in a life that is moving on toward God with sure though gradual step and is invested with an arresting grandeur that may not be fairly overlooked. Such faults are not unknown to the faithful soul. They are regretted by its awakened love as they foretell victories to come when strength and insight become equal to aspiration.

And again, the preacher should never overlook that what one is sincerely trying to do is as significant as what one has done in spiritual transformation. One's striving at any moment in the painful way of spiritual growth is the lovely echo sent back into the turmoil of life from the serene region of ideals, cherished with loyal faith and consecration. The life that is going on toward Christ, correcting, repenting, hoping in spite of wearying failures, is very near to Him and certain of His benediction. Faults that appear in one's spiritual ascent are qualitatively unlike those that appear as phases of surrender and indifference.

The most that one can wisely attempt then from this standpoint is to suggest the main thought that the Blessed Sacrament must be a significant factor in one's life and that one does well to study just the effect that it exerts or fails to exert in the development of character and spiritual aspiration. One who is led to take this point of view ought to find spiritual understanding clarified, piety refreshed and progress certain. Indifference to the presence of Christ, routine Communions, irreverent neglect of prayer, will not fail to yield, and thus obstacles to the transforming power of the Blessed Eucharist are overcome in the measure that may be reasonably expected. One can then answer with happy assurance the question, "What is the actual effect of the Blessed Sacrament in my life?"

II.

Reference was made to the tendency of many to isolate Holy Communion, to view it as a form of piety that begins and ends with itself as one detail of life like any other. One receives it and remains as one was. When, however, one

sees in it a power for living, a challenge to one's consecration, a pledge of deeper union with God, all such mistaken isolation is overcome and life becomes truly Eucharistic. One then develops the mental habit of associating Christ in the Blessed Sacrament with everything. And this by no means as an emotional pietistic attitude; rather as a law of life written by the hand of God. This is the missionary power of the Eucharist to every region of life, to every hope, ambition and interest around which solicitudes are organized. The Eucharist becomes one's standard of living. Reading, business, recreation, purposes, attitudes, relations to others, are cherished only in so far as they are consistent with the demands of loyalty to Christ in the Holy Eucharist. We well know how all such interests tend to work away from the discipline of spiritual truth and yield to selfishness that presses toward sin. The morning Communion is the pledge of a Eucharistic day. The penetrating jurisdiction of the Blessed Sacrament throughout all of life is an axiom to all who understand the mind of Christ as the Real Presence reveals it. The day ought to be different because its morning brought our Lord into intimate association with the soul. If it is not different, what is the mission of it as the Bread of Life? The disciples at Emmaus did not recognize our Lord as He walked and talked with them. But when He had disappeared they understood and remembered that their hearts had known when their minds did not. And thus when evening brings reflexion and the day is relived in quiet hours before sleep, the faithful soul will know, that here and there the thought of Communion appeared in resistance to temptation, in kindness, forgiveness, service, courage, and prayer. And if one be conscious of evil, it will have been because for the moment Holy Communion was forgotten and self betrayed one into false ways.

This conquest of life by the Blessed Sacrament, intended by Christ, is achieved but gradually. It is the work of a lifetime. But if one takes direction from it and holds to its appeal and direction as the mariner guides his ship by the constant star that points the way over trackless seas, all goes well. And then the chapter on the Blessed Sacrament in one's biography will tell wonderful things about its influence throughout one's life.

III.

In reviewing the spiritual experiences of a life, as the preacher may do from time to time, it will be helpful to direct attention to occasions when the soul's interests come to most complete expression. Some will be found whose sense of the presence of God is most alert in times of illness or disaster, in defeat or distress. Others are brought to a sense of God's nearness in resisting temptation. Some gain spiritual vision and realization through sin, and then they see God most clearly through tears of repentance. While such experiences are found universally, they appear to be in separate lives, unusual. The whole logic of the Blessed Sacrament seems to give to it a particular normal function of clarifying the sense of God's presence as an ordinary element in the consciousness of the faithful Christian.

In order to share this benediction, however, one must aim to acquire a positive active appreciation of Holy Communion. And this must be an intellectual effort, not merely an emotional and occasional effort. No one who is passive or inadvertent will profit by it as he should. This is again a case of isolating Holy Communion, of dealing with it as an incident that involves no particular attention other than routine preparation. One must try to free oneself from any such attitude and wish in all earnestness to make the Blessed Sacrament a high and worthy spiritual experience always. It is attitudes that count. To wish seriously to do this insures that it will be done. Again it is what one is trying earnestly to do that is important. Thoughtful preparation, reverence and attention, earnest prayer in thanksgiving are tributes that the faithful soul will always wish to offer to our Lord when approaching the Holy Table.

The lamented Bishop Curtis, whose life was a source of constant edification to those who knew him, referred often to a visit that he made to Cardinal Newman early in the course of his conversion. The Bishop was unable to sleep in the Cardinal's home because of his vivid realization of the Blessed Sacrament in the chapel. The thought of spending the night under the same roof with our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament overcame him. And the case of a well educated Irish American was somewhat similar. At the time men who received

Holy Communion four or five times a year were regarded as very pious. When this man was preparing for his Saturday confession he was silent, recollected and prayerful. The task at hand completely engaged him. His children tiptoed about the house. Conversation was subdued. Sunday morning was solemn and quiet. Only after Mass did the homely and lively activities of everyday living return. In both cases it was the Blessed Sacrament that dominated. While such experiences may have been unusual they illustrate the spirit of reverence and the sense of spiritual realization brought out by the meaning of our Lord to the souls that sought refreshment, light and peace from His coming.

Although few may be brought so far by their graces, all who receive Holy Communion ought to be animated by the wish to be as worthy as possible of their privilege. And thus the reception of the Blessed Sacrament should become a radiant experience. It should strengthen the sense of the nearness of God, improve the quality of all prayer, sharpen the sense of sin and quicken every impulse of resistance against it. When this is realized, Holy Communion takes a place in the story of one's life that is paramount. And the chapter on the Blessed Sacrament in such a biography will throw light over an entire life.

IV.

Our personal views of the meaning of the Blessed Sacrament to us will be governed largely by our sense of spiritual need and our aspiration toward vigorous life in Christ. While all lives differ widely, there is a measure of uniformity among them that makes intimate personal appeal in preaching possible. The Blessed Eucharist is the power of God offered to each life to tone down its strength, to reënforce its weakness, to purify its coarseness, to chasten its selfishness, to relieve its worry and terminate its confusion. It is only when we see in Christ the completion of self, only when we realize that we can do all things necessary by Him and nothing necessary without Him, that we take the first step in understanding the relation of the Holy Eucharist to daily living. The relation is intimate beyond all measure. And it is, therefore, personal and transforming. Christ gives us His best in Himself. We

owe Him our best in effort, appreciation and love. It is the privilege of those who as priests guide souls in their search for God to help the faithful to realize how near God is in the Blessed Sacrament and to help them to make the chapter in their biographies that tells what it has done for them, the most impressive and glorious in the story.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Washington, D. C.

NEAR-KIN MARRIAGES:

The Ethics of Human Inbreeding.

3. THE BIOLOGICAL GROUND.

WE now pass to the third or biological argument,—the contention that near-kin marriage leads to sterility and to defective offspring. The historical development of the argument is somewhat complicated. We may say at once, however, that in the main, so far as the Catholic theological and canonical literature is concerned, the argument dates only from the last century, and, in fact, in any real or consistent measure, only from the third quarter of the last century.

Apart from the statements of Gregory and Benedict Levita, to which we shall come back in a moment, Catholic theological and canonical literature is, so far as the present writer has been able to discover, practically silent as regards the biological argument until the early part of the last century. The first professional Catholic writer we have found broaching the question was De Maistre in his *Du Pape,* first published in 1817. Inspired very likely by Buffon's works, he inveighs against the royal and aristocratic families of Latin Europe for their intermarriages, implying that such marriages lead to sterility and to defective offspring.[30] A somewhat similar contention, very briefly stated, next occurs in the first, or 1827, edition of A. J. Stapf's *Theologia Moralis.* The Catholic sociologist, Taparelli, writes briefly in the same vein, in 1850, his data being evidently drawn from Buffon. In the 1819 and 1840 editions of Bergier's *Dictionnaire de Théologie,* as well as in the Italian edition of 1843, no mention is made of

[30] J. de Maistre, *Du Pape,* [written in 1817], l. ii, ch. vii, art. i, in *Oeuvres,* Paris, 1876, vol. ii, pp. 45-47.

the biological argument, but, significantly, a very short reference to it is inserted in the revised 1852 edition. Perrone in 1858 cites Taparelli. Martinet in 1867, after giving St. Thomas' four grounds, adds a few words on the biological argument, citing a scientific source, Boudin (1862), and quoting de Maistre in full. Le Noir's 1873 edition of St. Alphonsus' Moral Theology quotes Martinet in full by way of commentary. On the other hand F. Stapf in 1820 and 1829, Pouget in 1837, Carriere in 1837, Kenrick in 1861, Scavini in 1867, review the grounds for the prohibition, but make no mention whatever of the biological argument. From about 1870 on, however, this argument occurs quite consistently in the Catholic theological and canonical literature, although Leo XIII in his *Arcanum divinae,* 1880, refers only to the social argument.[31]

Let us inquire how this argument got into our Catholic literature. The concept seems to be unknown to the Jewish, Greek, and Roman writers, at least we have been able to find no trace of it in the Jewish or the Greco-Roman literature. The ancient Arabs and early Mohammedans apparently held that near-kin marriage affects offspring badly, if we may judge from the sayings quoted by Goldziher; for instance, "Marry among strangers; thus you will not have feeble

[31] A. J. Stapf, *Theologia moralis,* Oeniponti, 1827, vol. ii, § 312, p. 359; 4th ed., 1855, v. ii, § 306, p. 284; Luigi Taparelli, *Saggio teoretico di dritto naturale,* Napoli, 1850, vol. ii, sect. 1540, p. 333; N. S. Bergier, *Dictionnaire de théologie,* Toulouse, 1819, t. iii, pp. 136-37; 1840 ed., Liège, v, 157; Ital. tr., 1842, iii, 232, and 1843, iv, 110; nouv. ed., Lille, 1852, iii, 209; J. Perrone, *De matrimonio christiano,* Romae, 1858, l. ii, sect. i, c. iii, art. iv, vol. ii, p. 136; 1861 ed., ii, 128; A. Martinet, *Institutionum theologicarum quarta pars seu theologia moralis,* Paris, 1867, l. v, art. iv, § 1, vol. iii, pp. 329-30; S. Alphonsus Liguori, *Theologia moralis,* ed. D. Le Noir, Paris, 1873, l. v, tract. vi, De matrimonio, vol. iii, pp. 783-84; F. Stapf, *Vollstaendiger Pastoralunterricht ueber die Ehe,* 1st ed., Bamberg, 1820, pp. 308-10, and 4th ed., Frankfurt am Main, 1829, 265-67; F. A. Pouget, *Institutiones catholicae,* 9th ed., Avenione, 1837, pars iii, sect. i, c. viii, § 3, vol. ix, p. 248; Jos. Carriere, *De matrimonio,* Paris, 1837, v. ii, p. 34; F. P. Kenrick, *Theologia moralis,* Mechliniae, 1861, tract. xxi, c. v, no. 153, vol. ii, p. 319; P. Scavini, *Theologia moralis universa,* Paris, 1867, vol. ii, De vitiis, tract. iv, disp. ii, c. ii, art. i, p. 16; vol. iv, De sacramento matrimonii, tract. xii, disp. iii, c. ii, art. ii, pp. 580-81; Leo XIII, Arcanum Divinae, Feb. 14, 1880, in *Acta,* Romae, 1882, v. ii, p. 20; tr. in *Great Encyclical letters of Pope Leo XIII,* J. J. Wynne, N. Y., 1903, p. 66. For writers after 1870, cf., e. g., H. J. Feije, *De impedimentis et dispensationibus matrimonialibus,* [1st ed., 1867], 2d ed., Lovanii, 1874, c. xiii, sect. 348, p. 229; F. Santi, *Praelectiones juris canonici,* 4th rev. ed. by M. Leitner, Ratisbon, 1905, iv, 251-53; A. Tanquerey, l. c., v. i, no. 993, p. 585; Leitner, l. c., 149, with other references in footnote ibid.

posterity ".[32] But the belief so far as it existed among the ancient Arabs and Mohammedans went hand-in-hand with common first-cousin marriage, and does not appear to have passed over into Medieval Christian Europe. We have found no real indication of it among the Scholastics.[33] The belief is current among the modern Albanians: the offspring of near-kin marriages " would be blind, deaf, dumb, deformed ".[34] But whether this Albanian belief is a survival of very early more widespread European beliefs, a local development(such as we find in other parts of the world) in Albania, or a consequence of diffusion from western Europe in recent decades, it is not easy to say.

In the letter, of about 600 A. D., to St. Augustine of England, attributed to Pope Gregory the Great, but quite possibly not authentic, there occurs the following statement regarding the marriages of first cousins: " Experimento didicimus ex tali conjugio sobolem non posse succrescere ".[35] This statement is quoted by later writers: Rabanus Maurus in 842; St. Ives of Chartres around the end of the eleventh century; Peter Lombard in his Sentences about the middle of the twelfth; and St. Thomas in the third quarter of the thirteenth century.[36] But in all cases it is quoted without comment, where we would expect to find comment. St. Anselm, in the late eleventh or early twelfth century, obviously attempts to marshal all the arguments he knows against near-kin marriage, but, though dealing with them in considerable detail, makes no mention of the biological argument.[37]

[32] I. Goldziher, " Endogamy and polygamy among the Arabs ", in *The Academy*, July–Dec. 1880, xviii, 26; W. R. Smith, *Kinship and marriage in early Arabia*, new ed., London, 1903, 74-75. Frazer's attempt (*Psyche's task*, London, 1909, 41) to make out a case for belief by Greeks and Romans in sterility from incest is not very convincing.

[33] See discussion of Gregory's and Benedict's statements, infra.

[34] M. Edith Durham, " High Albania and its customs in 1908 ", in *Jour. Royal anthrop. inst.*, 1910, xl, 458.

[35] Gregory, Epistolarum lib. xi, Ep. lxiv, in *Mansi*, x, 407; in Migne, *P. L.*, lxxvii, col. 1189.

[36] Rabanus Maurus *De consanguineorum nuptiis*, in Migne, *P. L.*, cx, 1093; St. Ives, *Panormia*, l. vii, c. lvi, in Migne, *P. L.*, clxi, cols. 1293, and 1299; Peter Lombard, *Sententiarum libri quatuor*, l. iv, dist. xl, no. 3, in Migne, *P. L.*, cxcii, 938; St. Thomas, *Summa theol.*, l. c., *Suppl.*, q. liv, art. iii, vol. v, p. 200.

[37] St. Ambrose, l. c.

St. Thomas, in his Commentary on the Sentences, quotes the Gregorian statement from Peter Lombard, but it is very questionable whether or in how far he intends to subscribe personally to the statement. He cites it rather as an *argumentum ex auctoritate,* offsetting the five objections presented. He makes no comment on it in the body of the article, when he comes to presenting his own reasons against consanguineous marriages. If he had been aware, at first hand and independently of the Gregorian statement, of any currently held popular or scientific views or facts on sterility from near-kin marriage, he would almost certainly have used them, as, in citing Gregory, he argues that such resultant sterility would make incestuous marriages contrary to the *bonum prolis,* and consequently contrary to the law of nature. Moreover, he is perfectly well aware, and so states explicitly, that children can be born even from parent-offspring unions. Finally in his *Contra Gentiles* and in his *Secunda Secundae,* though discussing in detail the rational grounds against incest and incestuous unions, he does not cite the Gregorian statement at all, and does not make the slightest reference to possible biological results. St. Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas' teacher, guide, confrère and colleague, in his *De Animalibus* treats in great detail of the causes of sterility in man and animals, including sterility from cross-breeding of distinct species, but makes no mention of consanguineous mating as a cause. In his Commentary on Peter Lombard's Sentences he, like St. Thomas, cites the Gregorian statement in its context verbatim from the Sentences, but makes no comment whatever on it. His own reason is the social one, from St. Augustine.[38]

Later writers such as Tiraquelli, Sanchez, Perez, and Billuart, who deal at length with the grounds for the prohibition, omit Gregory's statement entirely or give no emphasis to it.[39]

[38] St. Thomas, *Summa theol.*, l. c., and 2a 2ae, q. cliv, art. ix, vol. iii, pp. 683-84; *Contra gentiles*, l. c., pp. 430-31; St. Albertus Magnus, *De animalibus,* l. x, tr. ii, c. i, and l. xvi, tr. ii, cc. i, viii-xi, ed. H. Stadler, in *Beitraege z. Gesch. d. Philos. d. Mittelalters*, Muenster i. W., 1916, v. xv, pp. 745-49, and 1920, v. xvi, pp. 1112-17, 1133-44; same, *Comm. in IV Sent.*, dist. xl, C and art. viii, in *Opera*, ed. Borgnet, Paris, 1894, v. xxx, p. 452.

[39] A. Tiraquelli, *De legibus connubialibus et iure maritali*, rev. ed., Lugduni, 1569, pp. 180-82; Th. Sanchez, *De sancto matrimonii sacramento*, [written 1603], Venice, 1726, l. vii, disp. li-liii, pp. 141-48; Mart. Perez ab Unánoa, *De*

Whence " Gregory " derived his statement it is hard to say. From Leviticus, 20: 20-21, Huth suggests.[40] But Huth's inference is very questionable. The penalty or curse of childlessness in Leviticus is upon incestuous relations with an uncle's or a brother's wife, while " Gregory " is speaking of cousins german. Moreover " Gregory " explicitly says: " *Experimento* didicimus." While this statement is quoted frequently by later writers it seemingly was not taken very seriously. At least the statement does not seem to suggest any facts known independently to those who quote him or any current popular belief to this effect. Rabanus Maurus, it may be added, in the very passage in which he cites " Gregory," expressly states that from the sex unions prohibited in Leviticus xx, 20-21, children have been born and are born, and hence the penalty of " childlessness " should probably be understood in a legal sense, that is, the children born shall not succeed to their parents or be reputed legally as children of their parents.[41]

In the false Capitularies of Benedict Levita dating from the middle of the ninth century, the following statement occurs: " Saepe in nuptiis clam factis gravia peccata tam in sponsis aliorum, quam in propinquis sive adulterinis conjugiis, et quod pejus est dicere, consanguineis, accrescunt vel accumulantur. Ex his autem procreari solent coeci, claudi, gibbi et lippi sive alii turpibus maculis aspersi ".[42]

The supposed injurious effects on offspring are here ascribed, if the present writer interprets the passage correctly, not to consanguineous marriages as such, but to clandestine marriages, including consanguineous ones. Benedict's statement is not quoted in any later source known to the present writer.

sancto matrimonii sacramento opus morale theologicum, Lugduni, 1646, disp. xxviii, sect. v, pp. 325-53; sect. vii, p. 356; C. R. Billuart, *Summa Sancti Thomae*, [publ. 1746-51], ed. J. B. J. Lequette, Paris, n. d., De matrimonio, diss. vii, art. iv, § iii, tom. vii, pp. 472-78, art. v, § iii, tom. vii, p. 481. Cf. Perin, *Tractatus selectus de matrimonio*, Lovanii, 1776, pp. 134-35; J. C. Trombelli, *Tractatus de sacramentis*, Bononiae, 1783, diss. ix, q. ii, c. i, sect. iv-vi, vol. iii, pp. 8-10.

[40] Huth, l. c., 30, 151.

[41] Rabanus Maurus, l. c., 1093.

[42] Benedictus Levita, *Capitularium collectio*, l. iii, no. 179, in Migne, *P. L.*, xcvii, col. 820; in *Monumenta Germaniae historica*, Legum, t. ii, pars ii, repr. Leipzig, 1925, p. 113.

It does not seem to have entered at all into the current of theological and canonical thought and discussion.

The earliest modern intimation we have come across of popular European belief in injurious results from consanguineous marriages as such is that contained in the curious booklet by Samuel Du-Gard, *The Marriages of Cousin Germans,* published at Oxford in 1673: "There is a judgment which is said often to accompany these Marriages, and that is a Want of Children and a Barrennesse". "The Children are weak, it may be; grow crooked, or, what is worse, do not prove well; presently, Sir, it shall be said what better could be expected? an unlawfull Wedlock must have an unprosperous successe".[43] Du-Gard takes sharp exception to the popular belief his booklet reflects. Jeremy Taylor in 1659 likewise took exception to the barrenness statement ascribed to Pope Gregory, but made no reference to any current belief in sterility from cousin marriage. Both Du-Gard and Taylor hold that such results are not verified by actual experience.[44]

Taylor appears to be unaware of the popular biological assumptions referred to fourteen years later by Dugard. He makes no mention of them, though he tersely denies the Gregorian contention as being against English experience. Yet he deals at great length with the subject and discusses one by one all the arguments against cousin marriage known to him, adding at the end: "I know of no more reasons pretended against this affair [cousin marriage]". Even Fry, writing in 1756, nearly a century after Du-Gard, appears unfamiliar with the biological argument, although he sets out to refute all the grounds proposed against cousin marriage, and expressly adds: "Thus have I considered all the arguments (that I know of) that have been urged from the nature and reason of things, against marriages betwixt collateral kindred". By the end of the eighteenth century, popular belief in harmful physical results from near-kin marriages seems to have been common, although ethicists were not generally making use of this belief as an argument. "It is sur-

[43] Samuel Du-Gard (or Dugard), *The Marriages of Cousin Germans, Vindicated from the Censures of Unlawfulnesse and Inexpediency,* Oxford, 1673, pp. 53, 51; cf. pp. 36, 50-51, 54-55, 97. Dugard was familiar with the works of Grotius and Jeremy Taylor.

[44] Jeremy Taylor, l. c., § 79, vol. i, p. 401; Dugard, l. c., 54.

prizing", wrote Noah Webster in 1790, in his interesting adventure in simplified spelling, "that modern writers on law and ethics should pass almost the only reezons of prohibiting marriage between blood relations." If brothers and sisters were to marry, "men would soon become a race of pigmies." If cousins marry, such unions "often produce imperfect children. The common people hav hence drawn an argument to proov such connections criminal; considering weakness, sickness and deformity in the offspring az judgements upon the parents." [45]

Burton in 1621, a half century before Du-Gard wrote, had referred to the greater possibility of hereditary disease in the offspring of already diseased near relatives, but the results upon offspring are ascribed by him, not to consanguineous marriage as such, but to diseases that might be transmitted from related parents to offspring.[46]

Du-Gard's and Webster's statements give us some insight into the *popular* belief more or less prevalent in their days. In the middle of the eighteenth century what appears to be the first evidence of *scientific* awareness of and attention to the question occurs in Buffon,—if Buffon can be called a scientist! After developing his theory of the necessiay of cross-breeding in animals, he makes some reflections on cross-breeding in man. The frequent migrations of peoples, have, he holds, by bringing about cross-breeding, helped the race. "Meanwhile one may believe that, through experience of which all memory has been lost, men in other times came to recognize the evil which resulted from alliances of the same blood, since among the least civilized nations it has rarely been permitted to a brother to marry his sister: this custom [of outbreeding] . . . is perhaps founded on observation; . . . if men once learned by experience that their race degenerated whenever they tried to conserve it in the same family without outbreeding, they would regard marriage into families not their own as a law of nature, and would all be in accord in not tolerating such unions between their own children. And in fact, analogy

[45] Taylor, l. c., § 82, vol. i, p. 402, devotes § 17 – § 89, pp. 370-404, to whole subject; Fry, l. c., 78; Noah Webster, "Explanation of reezons, why marriage iz prohibited between natural relations", in *A collection of essays and fugitiv writings*, Boston, 1790, no. xxvi, p. 324.

[46] Robert Burton, *The anatomy of melancholy*, [first ed. 1621], London, 1826, part i, sect. 2, member 1, subs. 6, vol. i, p. 89.

suggests the presumption that in most climates men would degenerate, just as animals do, after a certain number of generations ".[47]

During the second half and especially toward the end of the eighteenth century and during the first half of the nineteenth, accumulating evidence seemed to many breeders and experimenters to indicate that close inbreeding was injurious to plants and animals. Walker, in 1839, definitely holds that the results of human inbreeding are " domestic misery, sterility, or weak and unhealthy children ". In the bookseller's notices of about the same date printed at the beginning of the American edition of Walker's work, reviews of his book quoted from the Boston *Morning Post* and the New York *Evening Post* very definitely attest the fact that the belief in such results was at that period widespread in this country. " The imbecility of most of the royal families of Europe, is also to be attributed to their custom of marrying ' in-and-in ' " (Boston *Morning Post*). " It has long been a common observation that the intermarriage of persons related by consanguinity has an unfavorable effect upon the personal appearance and mental capacity of their offspring. . . . The phrenological writers have lately attempted some investigations of this subject, and have collected many curious instances to show that the danger of ill-health, personal deformity, idiocy, or insanity, is greatest, all other circumstances being equal, among the offspring of intermarriages between blood relations " (New York *Evening Post*). Some of the correspondence reproduced in Walker's work, such as the letter from Sir A. Carlisle, points to a similar belief as existing in England.[48]

About the same time a pioneer French alienist, Esquirol, alludes very briefly to the supposed higher incidence of mental derangement in inbred European groups.[49] But before 1850, or even before 1856-1858, there was almost no scientific literature on the physical and mental effects of human inbreeding.

[47] Buffon, *Histoire naturelle*, t. iv, Paris, 1753, Du cheval, pp. 221-22, cf. pp. 204-5, 215-17; in 1802 ed., t. x, 177-78, cf. 153, 167, 169, and t. iv, 301-2.

[48] Alex. Walker, *Intermarriage*, N. Y., 1839, p. 313; newspapers quoted, pp. 7-9, beginning of book; Carlisle letter on obverse of title page. Cf. Prosper Lucas, *Traité philosophique et physiologique de l'hérédité naturelle*, Paris, 1847-50, ii, 238-39.

[49] J. É. D. Esquirol, *Mental maladies*, tr. E. K. Hunt, Phila., 1845-49. French original written prior to 1840.

Devay, writing in 1857, knows only of short notes or articles by Menière and himself in 1846, and by Rilliet in 1856. Bemiss, writing in 1858, states: "Passing allusions to the evil consequences of marriages of consanguinity may be found in a number of authors, but the subject has not been made a point of special inquiry, so far as I have been able to learn, except by the Rev. Charles Brooks in a lecture before the American Association for Advancement of Science in 1855; by two French writers, Rilliet and Menière in 1856, and by the present reporter in 1857".[50]

From the forties and fifties on, beginning with the investigations made from the medical and scientific standpoint by Menière, Rilliet, and Devay in France and by Bemiss in America, the literature of the subject increases enormously. Article after article appears in the scientific publications of the day, particularly in the sixties. The flood continues well to the beginning of the present century, and is still continuing, although the contributions are now relatively less numerous. For instance, the Index Catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon-General's Office, U. S. Army, lists more than a hundred articles and books published on the subject between 1850 and 1887. With the rise of the science of genetics in the last part of the last century and the early part of the present, the discussion entered on a new phase, particularly after the re-discovery of Mendel's laws around 1900.[51] To the genetic side of the problem we shall return in a moment.

We may merely add in passing that the recent emphasis in Catholic canonical and theological literature on the biological

[50] F. Devay, *Du danger des mariages consanguins au point de vue sanitaire,* Paris-Lyon, 1857, pp. i-ii, 11-12, 15, 21-23, 33; S. M. Bemiss, "Report on influence of marriages of consanguinity upon offspring", extr. from *Trans. Amer. med. assoc.*, Phila., 1858, 5, cf. 5-6.

[51] Fairly complete bibliographies of the subject are available in: *Index-catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon-general's office, U. S. Army,* 1st ser. viii, 1887, pp. 617-19; 2d ser. iv, 1899, p. 56, and x, 1905, pp. 146-47, 3rd ser. iv, 1923, p. 143, and vii, 1928, pp. 972-73. For the newer evidence from genetics, see bibliography in H. E. Walter, *Genetics,* 3rd rev. ed., N. Y., 1931, 333-39. Extended discussion of the sources prior to 1875 in: Huth, l. c., ch. iv-vii; C. Darwin, *The variation of animals and plants under domestication,* 2d ed. [1875], repr., N. Y., 1897, ch. xvii-xviii, vol. ii, 92-126; of the sources prior to about 1920, in: Westermarck, l. c., ii, 218-39; Briffault, l. c., i, 204-38. On the relation of inbreeding to sterility, see Walter, l. c., ch. ix, and F. H. A. Marshall, *The physiology of reproduction,* 2d rev. ed., London – N. Y., 1922, 216-20, 639-44.

argument is almost certainly a reflection from the scientific study of inbreeding rather than from popular tradition such as it has been. De Maistre probably, and Taparelli certainly, were inspired by Buffon. Perrone is influenced by Taparelli. Martinet derives his data from De Maistre and a scientific writer, Boudin. Later writers, from Feije in 1874, to Santi in 1905, to Tanquerey in 1925, rely upon well-known sources hailing from the scientific group. In a word, the biological argument is derived from science and has come into our Catholic theological and canonical tradition in very modern times; in fact, it has been fully naturalized therein, so to speak, only for a little more than a half-century.

So much for the history of the argument. What is its validity? Does the scientific evidence at present confirm or refute the contention that near-kin marriage as such leads to sterility on the part of mates, to mental and physical defect on the part of offspring?

As for sterility, there is a possibility that long-continued human inbreeding may lead to the decrease of offspring. But we seemingly have no real proof that it does so in the case of continued first-cousin marriages, or that it would do so even in the case of continued brother-sister marriages. Our statistical evidence on the point does not carry conviction either one way or the other. Many gallant attempts have been made to interpret the available statistical data, but it has not proved possible to isolate the factor of near-kin marriage, from among the many other factors that are or may have been responsible for such relative sterility as has been found. There is some evidence that in certain plant and animal species long-continued inbreeding may result in decreased fertility, but the evidence is by no means consistent or conclusive. In many experiments involving long-continued closest inbreeding in plants and animals, no diminution in fertility has resulted. Many stock-breeders believe they find lowered fertility resulting from long-continued inbreeding. But other breeders are equally confident from their actual experience and practice that no such result ensues, if the breeding stock is sound. So far as man is concerned, the most we seem justified at present in concluding is that there is a *possibility* that an unknown factor may enter into the situation in the case of continued close

human inbreeding and may lead to decreased fertility, as it *perhaps* does in *some* species of plants and animals; but in the present state of our evidence we do not seem to be in a position to maintain that this hypothetical factor is any more than a possibility.

As for defective offspring, we seem to have no convincing evidence that near-kin marriage *of itself* results in defective offspring. In fact, the evidence we do possess seems to point toward the conclusion that neither mental nor physical defect follows from consanguineous marriages in themselves. Attention used to be called very frequently to the supposed high incidence of mental and physical defect in some of the royal and aristocratic families of Europe. Such families, the Hapsburgs and the Spanish nobility in particular, used often to be cited in proof of the assumption. Whether, however, the incidence of defect is really higher in such families than in families of non-aristocratic and non-royal connexion is not easy to prove. But, even though we were to grant the assumption of higher incidence, we should still have the task of proving that this higher incidence is due to inbreeding, and not to other factors that could easily be responsible for it. What does, however, appear quite clear is that in our most conspicuous historical case of royal inbreeding,—that among some of the Egyptian royal families, much of its brother-sister inbreeding,—we find no evidence of either mental or physical degeneration in the offspring.[52] About the same can be said of the royal inbreeding that occurred in the ancient Peruvian or Inca civilization.

It is true that in many cases assembled from our everyday contemporary life we find the offspring of cousin marriages showing mental or physical defects. We have, however, no statistical or other proof that such defects are more common or more serious among inbred unions than among outbred ones. Nor have we any proof from the available data that the *inbreeding itself,* rather than some other factor, is responsible for such defects as are found in the offspring.

In the following paragraphs we shall endeavor to summarize the present state of the evidence from genetics on the results of human inbreeding. The present writer can lay no claim to

[52] P. Popenoe, l. c., 428-32.

technical firsthand familiarity with the field of genetics. He has relied on the best recent sources and has sought the counsel of his friends and colleagues working in the field of biology and genetics.

If the inbreeding family is of sound stock, free from both dominant and patent defects and recessive and latent ones, the offspring of marriages between closely related members of the family will not, even from long-continued inbreeding, be defective. If the family stock is tainted with dominant or recessive defects, the offspring of near-kin unions within the stock will show higher incidence of defect. In a word, the *soundness or defectiveness of offspring depends, not on outbreeding or inbreeding as such, but on the soundness or defectiveness of the outbreeding or inbreeding stock.* If the stock is good, the offspring of consanguineous marriages " will be benefited by receiving a double dose, so to speak, of certain good traits of their ancestors ". If the stock " carries defective heredity, the children are doubly handicapped ". [53]

In theory, therefore, marriages between near kin belonging to sound stock are not injurious to offspring; instead they are beneficial. In practice, however, indiscriminate close inbreeding—and were there no legal, moral or customary prohibition against incestuous unions, such inbreeding would undoubtedly be in large measure indiscriminate—would almost certainly be detrimental to offspring. A live-stock breeder can study his animals and their ancestry and can mate best to best to improve his stock. Human mating, even the most optimistic in the extreme left wing of the eugenic forces would admit, will probably never come about in this manner on any large scale. The decisive factors that lead to or away from human mating are not farsighted eugenic ideals. We have no reason to anticipate that such highly disinterested and objective considerations will in the near—or even the remote—future play the leading rôle in men's and women's choices of marital partners. And even if they should, there would still remain a serious obstacle to be surmounted,—that of recessive defects.

Not all hereditable defects are patent. Many are latent, recessive. They are carried in the family stock, but lurk beneath the surface, as it were. Often they are not easily

[53] P. Popenoe, l. c., 432.

discovered. Even with the best of eugenic intentions, with the most disinterested motives, and with the most conscientious investigation of family stock, such hidden, recessive defective family traits would often escape notice. But what investigation would not bring to light, consanguineous marriage would, and "with surprising rapidity",[54] in accordance with the Mendelian laws.

On the other hand, if the two individuals from a family stock that carries hereditary recessive defects, were, instead of marrying in, to marry out into a family stock not carrying such defective traits, the recessive defects would tend to remain recessive. Here again, it is not outmarriage as such that does the trick, for outmarriage into a stock carrying the *same* recessives would have the same results that inbreeding within the defective stock would have. But the probabilities are against the second family stock carrying the *same* recessive defects that are carried by the first stock.

In a word, human inbreeding does not, so far as our evidence goes at present, of and in itself create defects, or of and in itself produce defective offspring. Practically however,—and human law and ethics must be built on actual, not theoretic, human ways and needs,—indiscriminate human inbreeding, by tending to bring recessive hereditary family traits to the surface in offspring, would be injurious to offspring.

Let us sum up the present state of the scientific evidence even at the risk of some repetition. The positive evidence for sterility from cousin marriage,—unless a tendency to sterility be itself a trait in a given family stock,—is at best tenuous, or, perhaps it would be more exact to say, nil. As regards defective offspring,—in theory, if the family stock from which the two related mates come is sound and free from latent defect, we can see no reason on genetic grounds why the offspring should be defective, and we appear to have no factual evidence that the offspring actually in such cases are so. In practice, however, it is very difficult to make sure that such recessive defects are absent, and furthermore even though it were possible in all or most cases to do so, it is unlikely that any large number of prospective mates would make or be in a position to make the investigation required to discover such

[54] P. Popenoe, l. c., 433.

defects in the family stock. Under a system of indiscriminate near-kin marriage, such latent defects would tend to come to the surface in the offspring, whereas under the prevalent system that prohibits such marriages, outbreeding or outcrossing is the rule, and in practice such outcrossing leads to the masking or suppression of recessive defects. In other words, regardless of the fact that, theoretically, defective offspring *need not* result were near-kin marriage socially approved, actually and in reality such approval would tend to increase defective offspring. Practically, then, even in the light of our newer genetic knowledge, outbreeding as a social policy appears preferable to inbreeding.[55]

SUMMARY.

We have reviewed the three chief grounds for human outbreeding from the historical and the ethical standpoints. The social appears first in Christian literature in the late fourth and early fifth century; the moral appears first in the thirteenth century; the biological, apart from a minor note, going back to about the beginning of the seventh century, is not emphasized until well past the middle of the last century. The germ of the social argument may have been derived from Greco-Roman or Jewish sources; the moral argument pretty clearly came from Jewish sources; the biological has quite clearly been taken over from modern scientific sources. As our evidence stands at present, the biological argument still has weight, but not the weight it was supposed by many to have a generation or so ago. Further evidence from the field of genetics may greatly strengthen or weaken this argument. The social and moral arguments have lost none of their cogency. Of these two the moral argument is probably the more fundamental and the more cogent.

JOHN M. COOPER

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[55] For standard summaries of present state of evidence from genetics, as affecting near-kin marriage, see: E. M. East and D. F. Jones, *Inbreeding and outbreeding*, Phila., 1919, esp. pp. 113, 140, and ch. ix, xi-xii; Walter, l. c., *passim*, esp. pp. 200-2, 305; H. S. Jennings, *The biological basis of human nature*, N. Y., 1930, ch. i, esp. pp. 21-22, 29-31, and pp. 235-37; W. E. Castle, *Genetics and eugenics*, 3rd rev. ed., Cambridge (Mass.), 1924, ch. xxxii, esp. pp. 275, 280-82, and pp. 323-24; M. F. Guyer, *Being well-born*, rev. ed., Indianapolis, 1927, pp. 172-75, 222-23; Edgar Altenburg, *How we inherit*, N. Y., 1928, ch. vii, pp. 129-55. Cf. also Popenoe's short but excellent discussion, l. c., 427-34.

A GREAT ELIZABETHAN CARDINAL.

William Allen: 1532-1594.

THIS present year sees the fourth centenary of the birth of a man who may most justly be termed the founder of our post-"Reformation" secular priesthood. Without the feeders he created in the English colleges of Douai, Reims, and Rome, which continued their task of supplying clergy from Elizabethan times and throughout the centuries of active or passive persecution which followed, one may wonder what the position of the Church in England would be to-day.

It might with some certainty have in actuality become that negligible quantity in number and influence which certain politicians at the time of Catholic Emancipation argued as a reason for granting a tardy measure of reparation.

William Allen, better known on the Continent by the Latinized form of his patronymic *Alanus*, was born in 1532 at Rossall Grange in the County of Lancaster. He came of ancient stock: the Allens of Rossall Grange and Toderstaffe Hall. His birthplace owed its name to a grange built by Cistercian monks of Dieulacres, from whom the Allens held their lands on lease. All that now remains of the old hall is an ancient watchtower in the grounds of Rossall School.

Allen's deep love for his old home is instanced by the first item in his will, whereby he bequeaths the ornaments of his private chapel in Rome to St. Michael's-le-Wyne, mother church of Poulton, the parish church of Rossall. This gift bears the significant condition which still awaits fulfilment: "*Si regnum Angliae ad fidem Catholicam revertatur.*"

William Allen was the third great churchman of Tudor times. More erudite than Wolsey, equally renowned with Pole for great virtue and winning demeanor, he excelled the Queen's cousin as a writer and controversialist. The future Cardinal combined in his life two outstanding and, as some may deem, two diametrically opposing characteristics, which, however, were never allowed by him to overlap.

As the creator and sagacious director of the English seminaries beyond the seas, he was most eminently successful in his endeavors and aims to supply a continuing stream of new recruits for the English mission. In later life an ardent sup-

porter of the Spanish enterprise for the relief of Elizabeth's Catholic subjects by means of armed force, he was compelled to see his efforts frustrated and, by his fellow-countrymen of the Old Religion, even unappreciated. Yet, although his work for the education of English ecclesiastical students abroad fully merited the Red Hat, in actual fact, by the irony of fate, it was granted on the express petition of Spain to the agent of "*la haute politique*" who failed, rather than to the great ecclesiastical educationalist who succeeded.

William Allen was entered as a student of Oriel College, Oxford, in his fifteenth year. He early displayed an extraordinary aptitude for learning. Three years later he took his Bachelor's degree, and was unanimously elected at the age of eighteen a Fellow of his College. At twenty-two he proceeded M.A. He had only attained his twenty-fourth year when appointed Principal of Saint Mary's Hall, and a Proctor of the University.

Thus he had attained, at an abnormally early age, an apex in his university career, when the force of that triple wave which was destined to overwhelm Catholic England swept Allen away from her shores.

The three Acts passed by Elizabeth's first Parliament, reviving that severance from Rome initiated by her father, declaring the Queen's headship of the Church, and decreeing uniformity in matters of religion, had nullified the solemn reconciliation to Catholic unity pronounced by Cardinal Pole in the previous reign. Yet it was by six votes only in the Upper House and with much opposition from bishops and peers, that the Mass was abolished. And thereafter all the fourteen bishops, save the renegade Kitchen of Llandaff, languished in prison.

The Carthusian and Benedictine congregations, restored by Queen Mary, sought refuge abroad, while a majority of the Marian clergy withheld its acquiescence in the new state of things. At the universities especially feeling ran high. At Louvain the young Oxford don found many fellow exiles.

In 1562, illness induced him to return in disguise to his old Lancashire home, where the strong sea-breezes speedily revived his strength. Meanwhile, in England religion remained in a transitional state. Many of the old Marian priests

read the new office in their parish churches, whilst celebrating Mass in private. In not a few instances they would communicate Catholics with Hosts consecrated at home, whilst administering bread and wine to others more complaisant to the new order.

The question of "occasional conformity" had arisen, to be sternly vetoed by Pope and Council. There could be no middle course for the faithful.

From Lancashire Allen traveled into Oxfordshire and Norfolk. The reigning Pope, Pius IV, endeavored to approach Elizabeth in a concilatory spirit and sent her a letter addressed to "his most dear daughter, Elizabeth, Queen of England". His messenger was refused permission to land.

The Pope's invitation to Elizabeth, in common with other Protestant princes, to send a representative to the Council of Trent met with no better reception. Later, the Queen's advisers asked for a prorogation of the Council's sittings to enable her representatives to attend, but this request was, not unnaturally, declined. The sole Englishman to take part in the Council was Thomas Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph, later named as Bishop on the English Mission, a post which age and infirmity precluded his fulfilling.

On leaving England for the second time, Allen proceeded to Malines where he received minor orders and the priesthood, and of which city at the close of his life he was elected Archbishop. In 1565 he published the first of his famous controversial works, *A Defence and Declaration of the Church's Doctrine Concerning Purgatory and the Souls Departed.* So clear, learned and exhaustive is this work, that done into modern English spelling it was republished as recently as 1886.

Accompanied by his close friend and future collaborator, Dr. John Vendeville, he journeyed to Rome, where the learned Dominican, Michael Ghisleri, afterward to be canonized as Saint Pius V, occupied the throne of Peter. On their way home the travelers spent some time at Milan, of which city St. Charles Borromeo was the Archbishop, and met the famous Jesuit writer Robert (afterward Cardinal and now Saint) Bellarmine.

On his return to Flanders, Allen proceeded to start the famous English College of Douai, which with intermissions,

due to revolutionary troubles, continued to be an educational centre until the Combes ministry in the latter part of the nineteenth century drove religious orders out of France.

In this enterprise Allen received very material assistance from Vendeville, lately nominated Regius Professor of Canon Law, in the newly constituted University of Douai, and subsequently Bishop of Tournai.

On Michaelmas Day 1568, the college was opened, with at first a mere handful of students. Circumstances compelled rigid economy, and the living was so poor that several students found it impossible to endure the meagre scale of diet and left. Included among these was John Marshall, afterward Canon of Lille, where he lived to an advanced age, greatly esteemed for his piety.

Of the three other first English members of the college, Richard Bristow deserves special mention. Of a middle-class Worcestershire family, he had conformed to the new religion and, M.A. of Christ Church, Oxford, was noted for his learning and oratory. So much so that he had been chosen with the famous Jesuit proto-martyr, Edmund Campion, to hold a public disputation before Elizabeth on her visit to Oxford in 1566, in which both gained universal applause.

If the living at Douai in these early days was poor, the same could certainly not be said of the curriculum. Allen especially directed great attention to disputations and preaching in English, in addition to humanities, philosophy, and theology. Nothing was left undone to ensure the keenness of the weapon being forged to counteract the enactments of Elizabeth and her ministers against the Catholic Faith. Thus was the gauntlet thrown down to the persons who had determined on the total eradication of Catholicism in England.

They, on their part, were not slow in taking up the challenge, but their defeat is clearly proved in that, despite rack, rope and quartering-knife, there continued to exist a sturdy plant to blossom out anew at the "Second Spring".

The next name in the Douai Diary is that of the great controversialist Stapleton, followed shortly after by Edmund Campion, then in his thirtieth year. Campion, had he so desired, could have had almost any preferment in the new Church of England. In fact, even after his arrest and im-

prisonment in after years, he is said to have been offered by the Queen an archbishopric as a reward for apostacy.

The new college proceeded to flourish and increase. In 1571 it had nearly one hundred students on its rolls. The year 1573 saw the departure of Campion for Rome and the Company of Jesus. The fact that he had accepted deacon's orders in the Protestant Church was continually a source of sorrow and regret, and he sought consolation in the life of a religious. It may be noted here that Allen made no effort to retain him or any other of his students who felt a higher call. There was no room for jealousy amongst the captains of God's army, whatever might later develop amongst the rank and file of the laity in England.

In 1570 Pius V issued his famous Bull *Regnans in Excelsis.* It was grounded on the following decree of the fourth Council of Lateran in 1215. "If a temporal lord after having been required and admonished by the Church shall neglect to cleanse his land from the defilement of heresy . . . let that be signified to the Sovereign Pontiff, that he may thereupon declare his vassals freed from their allegiance to him and offer his land for seizure by Catholics."

There can be no question whatever of the Pope's justification to excommunicate Elizabeth. She had deliberately cut herself and her people adrift from the barque of Peter. There existed precedents for the further drastic provisions of the bull. Moreover, the above quoted decree of Lateran distinctly lays down the course pursued by Pius V. But it was obviously impossible to give effect to the bull's further provisions without recourse to the secular arm. And the latter was by no means ready to strike.

Philip II, writing to his Ambassador, De Spes, in London, deprecated the bull and only too truly and prophetically declared that it would inevitably lead to further oppression of Catholics. Subsequent Pontiffs expressed themselves as dubious of the wisdom of the step taken by their predecessor, instancing the fact that the excommunication of Henry VIII, although pronounced, had never been officially promulgated. One writer has described it as "a blunder because it failed".

On the Feast of Corpus Christi, 15 May, 1570, John Felton, the representative of a rich and ancient Norfolk family, affixed

a copy of the bull to the door of the Bishop of London's house. On the scaffold, though he would accord to Elizabeth no other name but that of Pretender, he expressed sorrow if he had offended her. Drawing from his finger a diamond ring worth £400, he sent it to the Queen by the Earl of Sussex, who was attending his execution.

In 1574 the first fruits of Douai landed in England to assist the old Marian priests whose numbers were calculated to be as many as five to six hundred. It had been for some time in mind at Rome to create an English Cardinal who should have special oversight over English affairs, and Dr. Nicholas Sanders was thought of in this connexion. He was the author of *The Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism.* It had a phemonenal success, running into fifteen editions in ten years. An extraordinarily apt work, it reads, translated into English, even after three hundred and fifty years, as accurate and timely a dissertation disposing of modern Anglican claims as any recently written volume on the subject.

In 1580 a Rescript of Gregory XIII explained that the Bull *Regnans in Excelsis* only bound Catholics if and when executed. This was in reply to questions put to the Holy See as to the position of Catholics in England in regard to the decree of Pius V. In detail the rescript laid down the rules which should guide the faithful and their effect was practically to suspend the operation of the bull.

The Pope's appreciation of Allen was shown by his presentation to a canonry of Cambrai. About this time the authorities at Douai, which had become a hot-bed of Orange activities, were compelled to give way to a popular demand for the expulsion of the English students, who were accused of being pro-Spanish in their predilections. It was a ridiculous charge, for politics were the very last things spoken of at the College. Politician as Allen was forced later to be, he never permitted the entry of politics into the seminaries he founded. Yielding to circumstances, however, he moved his college to Reims, a four days' journey from Douai. Later, the Douai magistracy begged for its return to the place of its founding, which offer Allen deemed it prudent to decline.

During the ten years at Douai the college had sent out seventy-four priests to the English mission, including the proto-martyr of the secular clergy, Blessed Cuthbert Mayne.

Allen was concerned in a plot to marry Don John of Austria, half-brother of Philip, King of Spain, with Mary, Queen of Scots. Don John had achieved much honor by the victory off Lepanto of the Papal and Venetian fleet under his command, when the Turkish fleet was utterly routed and its commander, Barbarossa, taken captive.

The English Government, wishful to get rid of both Allen and Don John, made use of the services of one Radcliffe, a brother of the Earl of Sussex. Coming to Reims, he was received by Allen who dismissed him after giving him some good advice. Undeterred by this, Radcliffe and his cousin visited the camp of Don John and managed to effect entry into the prince's tent, but were seized and disarmed before they could effect their murderous project. Shortly after this Don John died, at the early age of twenty-four, of a camp malady which had decimated his troops. His last act, like that attributed to Richard Cœur de Lion, was to ask pardon for his would-be murderers. But in this history repeated itself, for they were subsequently executed.

The instigator of these attempts is believed to have been Elizabeth's minister, Walsingham. Further steps were taken against Allen, who was beginning to be considered a serious inconvenience to the English Government. His extradition from France was demanded but refused by the French King, who privately assured Allen of his sympathy and protection against " that woman ".

The second monument to the organizing powers and religious zeal of William Allen exists and flourishes to this day in the English College at Rome, affectionately known as the *Venerabile*. Founded by Allen in 1575 as a seminary in the centre of Christendom for students destined to the English mission, it has continued to flourish in the very ground in which it was implanted. It was initiated under the benevolent favor and with the substantial help of the then reigning Pontiff and has ever since been the object of paternal solicitude to his successors.

It included among its alumni both English and Welsh students and, as even ecclesiastical students are not always immune from human failings, there occurred squabbles between the two nationalities which increased to a more than

negligible extent. It was thought better to substitute an Italian Rector and for one hundred and ninety-four years the English College was ruled by members of the Company of Jesus.

The continuing invasion of England by Allen's army had by no means escaped the attention of Elizabeth's ministers. By statute 27 (Elizabeth) it was declared high treason for any priest ordained abroad to enter the realm of England. In virtue of this, every priest secular or regular who set his foot on English soil became entitled to the crown of martyrdom if and when discovered. In 1581 Blessed Edmund Campion was one of the first to win the palm-branch in virtue of the new enactment.

The following year saw the appearance of the Reims translation of the New Testament, the translator being Gregory Martin. Following the new penal laws against the clergy, Lord Burghley had published an apologia for their severity entitled *Execution of Justice in England not for Religion but for Treason*. In his usual masterly manner, Allen traversed the preposterous statement in his reply, proving clearly that in every case the priest had the opportunity of saving his life by declaring Elizabeth to be head of the Church.

Whilst always actively interested in the English seminaries in France and Italy, the later portion of Allen's life was much interwoven with political issues. It may be said that in the troublous times in which he lived it was practically impossible for anyone leading a public life not to be in some degree mixed up in politics. But Allen's political proclivities toward Spain were actuated solely and entirely by the burning desire which consumed him to see his beloved land once more the dowry of Mary.

He could see no hope, save in the strong arm of Spain, for the downfall of the ruler who, spurred on by her advisers, was warring implacably against the Lord and against His anointed priests. But his motives were not altogether appreciated by the Catholic laity as a whole. Apart altogether from that somewhat insular prejudice against foreigners which prevails in certain circles even to this day, English Catholics remained loyal to the sovereign who was persecuting them. They were indeed foremost in preparation to repel the armed forces of Spain, and one of their number, Lord Howard of

Effingham, was indeed constituted Lord High Admiral of the Queen's Navy.

It was simply a case of spontaneous and unbiased loyalty to Elizabeth as ruler of their bodies—but not of their souls. They neither expected nor received any consideration for their patriotic attitude. If anything, their lot after the Spanish defeat became even more stringently a persecution. Although they were aware that Elizabeth was bastardized by reason of her father's illicit union with Anne Boleyn, they preferred her claim as an Englishwoman to the throne to the somewhat shadowy family claim of Philip.

It was at this time that Sixtus V, on the urgent petition of Philip II, created Allen a Cardinal under the name and style of "The Cardinal of England", with wide powers of jurisdiction and protection of Catholics in England who at that time were entirely without bishops of their own. In the discussions as to filling various high posts in England in the event of a Spanish victory, it was decided that Cardinal Allen should be nominated to the Archbishopric of Canterbury and temporarily also to be Lord Chancellor.

Of the Armada enterprise itself little need be said save that it was badly planned and most incompetently commanded. The Duke of Medina Sidonia, appointed to the supreme command because the grandees and hidalgos of Spain would serve under a leader of no lesser rank, had no desire for the honor thrust upon him. He continually pleaded excuses, alleging his incompetence in navigation and warfare, and his being apt to succumb to sea-sickness the minute he left shore. But all his arguments and entreaties were over-ruled.

The heavy top-hampered galleasses proved no match for the storms off the English coast and the harrying by the lightly-built and armed English vessels.

In 1589 Cardinal Allen was nominated by King Philip to the archiepiscopal see of Malines. Although his name figures in the official list of archbishops and he occasionally signed himself "elect of Malines", he never received episcopal consecration or took possession of his see.

He died at Rome, 16 October, 1594, in the firm belief that eventually through the crown of Spain the kingdom of England would return to obedience of the Holy See. That

he proved wrong in this assumption has for three centuries been well known to history.

In so far as he was associated with political schemes having for their object the forcible reconquest of England, his life was undoubtedly a failure. But this omission is far overshadowed by the success of what was in reality his life's work —the eventual regeneration of his beloved country in part by means of the laborers he sent forth into the vineyard and their successors. It may well be in the Providence of God that his faith in the return of England eventually to union and communion with the Holy See may yet be amply justified, and that it is to come through the means of that apostolic work to which he devoted the best part of a life spent wholly in the service of Christ and His Church.

JOSCELYNE LECHMERE.

Falmouth, England.

Analecta

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE.

Ampliantur Indulgentiae concessae pro Visitatione Ssmi Eucharistiae Sacramenti.

Pius Pp. XI.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Litteris Nostris "Caritate Christi" nuperrime editis christifideles omnes ad scelerum hominum expiandorum studium peculiaribus piis exercitiis die Divini Cordis sacra peragendis, circum altaria provolutos Redemptorem nostrum Iesum Christum sub Sacramenti velis delitescentem venerantes, instantissime excitavimus. Iure meritoque propterea, Conventus Eucharistici internationalis, qui Dublinensi in civitate proxime celebrabitur, occasionem nacti, ut christifideles, expiabilibus huiusmodi piaculis omne suum studium devotionemque conferant in illud Cor Sacratissimum, a quo magnum Eucharistiae Sacramentum manavit, indulgentias quas rec. mem. Decessor Noster Pius Pp. IX, suis sub anulo Piscatoris Litteris, die XV mensis Septembris an. MDCCCLXXVI christifidelibus Augustum Sacramentum devote visitantibus largitus est: Nos, pro benignitate Nostra, nunc ampliandas censemus. Conlatis igitur consiliis cum dilecto filio Nostro Laurentio titulo Sancti Pancratii presbytero Cardinali Lauri, Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Poenitentiario Maiore, quem Nostrum etiam mittimus Legatum ad eundem Dublinensem Con-

ventum, praesentium Apostolicarum Litterarum tenore, de omnipotentis Dei misericordia et beatorum Eius apostolorum Petri ac Pauli auctoritate confisi, omnibus et singulis utriusque sexus christifidelibus, corde saltem contritis, quoties ipsi ubique terrarum Sanctissimum Eucharistiae Sacramentum devote visitaverint ac quinque *Pater, Ave* et *Gloria* recitaverint, addita quoque unius *Pater, Ave* et *Gloria* ad mentem Nostram sive Summi Pontificis pro tempore exsistentis recitatione, *decem annos* de iniunctis eis, seu alias quomodolibet debitis poenitentiis, in forma Ecclesiae consueta, relaxamus; *plenariam* vero omnium peccatorum suorum *indulgentiam* et remissionem misericorditer in Domino largimur, semel in hebdomada lucrandam, iisdem christifidelibus vere poenitentibus et confessis ac sacra Communione refectis, qui ipsam Augusti Sacramenti visitatione per integram hebdomadam peregerint, ibique, ut supra, oraverint. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuslibet. Praesentibus perpetuis futuris temporibus valituris.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, sub anulo Piscatoris die III mensis Iunii Sacratissimo Iesu Cordi sacro, anno MDCCCCXXXII, Pontificatus Nostri undecimo.

E. CARD. PACELLI, *a Secretis Status.*

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII.

DECRETUM DE GRATIARUM ET OBLATIONUM IN PIIS EPHEMERIDIBUS EVULGATIONE.

Vulgantur copiosius in dies, praesertim penes celebriora Orbis sanctuaria, piae ephemerides eo consilio concinnatae, ut res ibidem gestae referantur, atque fidelium pietas erga caelestes Patronos, quorum sub nomine inscribuntur, peculiariter foveatur. Inter relata locum habere solet enarratio gratiarum vel caelestium beneficiorum, quae eorumden Sanctorum patrocinio a fidelibus impetrata perhibentur, addita, ut plurimum, stipis hanc ob causam corrogatae adnotatione.

Verum, si finis ob quem et commentarii eduntur et oblationes colliguntur, incrementum videlicet devotionis in Sanctos, aedium sacrarum exstructio et decor, operum caritatis fundatio, laude dignus in se sit, ratio tamen, qua haud raro beneficia caelestia referuntur accepta, inepto nempe sermone et absque ullo authenticitatis signo, probari nequit, praecipue si perpen-

datur in narratis acceptum beneficium ita cum oblata pecunia saepe connecti, ut alterum ab altero pendere videatur. Quod quidem, cum turpis lucri speciem praeseferre facile queat, occasionem saltem praebere potest admirationis iis potissimum, qui praeiudicatis opinionibus adversus catholicum cultum sunt imbuti.

Ad haec igitur incommoda praecavenda, haec Sacra Congregatio Concilii, consiliis initis cum Sacra Congregatione de Religiosis, atque Ssmo Dno Pio Pp. XI probante, Ordinarios locorum Superioresque religiosorum maiores monendos censet:

I. Ut praescripta canonum 1261 et 1386 Codicis iuris canonici sedulo servari iubeant, abusus compescendo.

II. Ut praeviae censurae ecclesiasticae, ad normam eiusdem canonis 1386, scripta harum ephemeridum rite accurateque submittant, atque ipsorum onerata conscientia, facultatem easdem edendi ne faciant, nisi praehabita peculiaris Censoris ex officio, ad praescriptum Encyclicae *Pascendi* Pii Pp. X, diei 8 Septembris 1907, favente sententia, eaque singulis vicibus scripto danda. Caveat itaque Censor ut enarrata, quae sub gratiarum nomine exhibentur, ea praeseferant credibilitatis signa ut, omnibus prudenter perpensis, fidem mereri possint, atque insuper ut omnis inter gratiam obtentam et eleemosynam oblatam vel minima connexionis suspicio exsulet.

III. Ut huius generis narrationes, his praescriptis non congruentes, nonnisi sub generica indicatione gratiae acceptae et absque ulla facti expositione in vulgus edi permittant.

Quae si diligenter observentur, finem in quem intendunt, piae, quas commemoravimus, ephemerides assequentur, nec quidquam in iis reprehendere licebit, quod a christiana pietate sit absonum.

Datum Romae, die 7 mensis Iunii anno 1932.

I. Card. Serafini, *Praefectus.*

L. * S.

I. Bruno, *Secretarius.*

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES.

PROPER OFFICE AND MASS OF SAINTS ISAAC JOGUES, JOHN DE BREBEUF, AND THEIR COMPANIONS, APPROVED.

FEAST ON 26 SEPTEMBER, FOR DIOCESES OF NORTH AMERICA.

On 29 June, 1930, our Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, happily concluded the solemn canonization of the Saints and Martyrs, Isaac Jogues, John de Brebeuf, and their Companions, Martyrs, of the Society of Jesus, the first in America to seal with their blood the Catholic faith. The Rev. Father Charles Miccinelli, Postulator General of the same Society, in virtue of a commission of his Eminence Cardinal Patrick Hayes, Archbishop of New York, and in the name of their Excellencies, the other Ordinaries of the whole republic in the United States of North America, begged of our Holy Pontiff and Lord his approval of a proper Mass and Office, and inscription in the Roman Martyrology, of the same newly canonized saints on their feast, to be celebrated yearly on 26 September by the clergy of all the dioceses of the United States of North America. Our Holy Lord, Pope Pius XI, propitiously accepted the petition, submitted by the Postulator General of the Society of Jesus, in the name of his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of New York and also of their Excellencies the other Ordinaries of all the dioceses of North America and presented by the undersigned Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, and he graciously permitted that, on the feast of the Holy Martyrs Isaac Jogues and John de Brebeuf and their Companions, to be celebrated by all the dioceses of the United States on 26 September with the rite of a double of the second class, the aforesaid proper Office, Mass, and inscription in the Roman Martyrology, already revised and approved by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, might be used by the entire clergy according to the rubrics. Anything to the contrary notwithstanding. The twenty-seventh day of January, 1932.

C. CARD. LAURENTI, *S.R.C. Prefect.*

A. CARINCI, *S.R.C. Secretary.*

SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA.

(Officium de Indulgentiis.)

I.

DECRETUM DE INDULGENTIIS "STATIONIBUS" ADNEXIS.

Ut fideles ferventius ac religiosius ad sacras aedes conveniant, ubi, statis anni diebus, prout in Missali Romano designantur, quadragesimali praesertim tempore, statio celebratur, atque ibidem pias recolant Sanctorum, maxime Martyrum, memorias, quorum Reliquiae palam tunc expositae, ad eorum imitandam caritatem, sectanda exempla vehementer animum accendunt, Romani Pontifices, temporum decursu, pro uniuscuiusque pietate indulgentias largiti sunt iis qui stationales, ut vocant, ecclesias, sive in urbe sive extra Urbem posterius constitutas, frequentent.

Cum vero indulgentiae huiusmodi, variae ac multiplices, minus visae sint uniformes et, quod ad lucrandi modum minus in praesens accommodatae, Ssmus D. N. Pius Pp. XI, quo facilius expeditiusque acquiri possint, in audientia diei 18 Martii p. p., infrascripto Cardinali Poenitentiario Maiori concessa, in unius disciplinae formam eas redigi voluit, benigneque indulsit ut fideles omnes: (1) qui, vere poenitentes, confessi ac sacra Synaxi refecti, ecclesiam stationalem, diebus statutis, devote visitaverint, sacrisque functionibus intererint quae matutinis vel vespertinis horis ibidem ex consuetudine aut ex positiva Ordinariorum praescriptione peragantur, necnon iuxta Summi Pontificis mentem pie oraverint, *plenariam* indulgentiam lucrentur; (2) si vero nulla publica supplicatio in stationali ecclesia locum habuerit, *plenariam* pariter indulgentiam lucrentur suetis conditionibus confessionis et Communionis, recitatis tamen quinquies *Pater, Ave* et *Gloria* coram Ssmo Sacramento, ter *Pater, Ave* et *Gloria* coram ss. Reliquiis venerationi expositis, semel saltem *Pater, Ave* et *Gloria* ad Summi Pontificis intentionem; (3) qui autem stationalis ecclesiae visitationem tantummodo peregerint, recitatis saltem corde contrito supra dictis precibus, consequantur indulgentiam *decem annorum*. Praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla Brevis expeditione et contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex Sacra Poenitentiaria Apostolica, die 12 Aprilis 1932.

L. CARD. LAURI, *Poenitentiarius Maior.*

L. * S.

I. Teodori, *Secretarius.*

II.

ARCHICONFRATERNITATI DOCTRINAE CHRISTIANAE ADSCRIPTIS NOVA INDULGENTIA PLENARIA CONCEDITUR.

Die 2 Martii 1932.

Sacra Poenitentiaria Apostolica christifidelibus Archiconfraternitati Doctrinae Christianae, in ecclesia S. Mariae de Planctu Urbis canonice erectae, adscriptis benigne concedit *plenariam Indulgentiam* die festo S. Roberti Bellarmino lucrandam, si confessi sacra Synaxi refecti fuerint. Praesenti in perpetuum absque ulla Brevis expeditione valituro. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

L. CARD. LAURI, *Poenitentiarius Maior.*

L. * S.

I. Teodori, *Secretarius.*

DIARIUM ROMANAE CURIAE.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS.

3 April, 1931: His Excellency the Most Rev. John B. Morris, Bishop of Little Rock, assistant at Pontifical Throne.

Protonotary Apostolic ad instar participantium:

9 March, 1932: Monsignor Eugene C. Laflamme, of the Archdiocese of Quebec.

Monsignor William Quinn, of the Diocese of Lincoln.

Domestic Prelates of His Holiness:

3 December, 1929: Monsignor Michael Francis O'Rourke, of the Diocese of Scranton.

4 February, 1932: Monsignors Andrew P. Mahoney and Peter Langlois, of the Diocese of London, Canada.

30 February: Monsignor John Ryan, of the Diocese of Killaloe.

24 March: Monsignor Augustin Emery, of the Archdiocese of Birmingham.

Monsignor Maurice I. Morrissy, of the Diocese of Plymouth.

10 April: Monsignor Joseph Murphy, of the Diocese of Harbor Grace, Newfoundland.

27 April: Monsignors Charles Edward Brunault, Louis Alfred Cote and Ferdinand Albert Saint-Germain, of the Diocese of Nicolet.

10 May: Monsignor Louis A. Marchant, of the Diocese of Fall River.

16 May: Monsignor David Joseph Heelan, of the Diocese of Sioux City.

Knights Commander of the Order of Pope St. Sylvester:

27 April, 1932: Messrs Charles Bourgeois and Adelard Provencher, of the Diocese of Three Rivers.

Privy Chamberlains supernumerary of His Holiness:

19 May, 1932: Monsignors Victor Mlejnek and Luke Leo Mandeville, of the Diocese of Lincoln.

Studies and Conferences

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

APOSTOLIC LETTER grants new indulgences for visits to the Most Blessed Sacrament: (1) *indulgence of ten years* may be gained by those who visit the Blessed Sacrament and recite there five *Pater, Ave, Gloria,* with the addition of one *Pater, Ave, Gloria* for the intention of the Sovereign Pontiff—under the usual conditions of confession and Communion; (2) *plenary indulgence* may be gained once a week by those who visit the Most Blessed Sacrament each day of the week and there recite the same prayers as mentioned above—under the usual conditions of confession and Communion.

S. CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL issues a decree directing attention of publishers and editors of periodicals and organs of pious shrines, to the prescriptions of canons 1261 and 1396 of the Code.

S. CONGREGATION OF RITES approves proper Mass and Office of Saints Isaac Jogues, John de Brebeuf, and Companions, for their feast to be celebrated on 26 September every year, in all the dioceses of the United States.

S. APOSTOLIC PENITENTIARY (1) unifies the indulgences to be gained by visit to the "stational" churches in Rome. (2) Plenary indulgence may be gained on the feast of St. Robert Bellarmine by members of the Archconfraternity of Christian Doctrine.

ROMAN CURIA announces officially recent Pontifical appointments.

TOWARD INTELLIGENT APPRECIATION OF THE BREVIARY.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In the *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner*, by Dr. Edwin H. Burton, there is a brief account of the daily routine of that saintly ecclesiastic, written by the famous Catholic layman, Charles Butler, who knew the Bishop in his later years. Mr. Butler wrote:

> He [Bishop Challoner] said his Office with his chaplains. These were the happy hours of his life. It was his delight after the agitation and hurry of business to repeat with them the tender and soothing psalms, hymns, and prayers of which it is composed. By this, any ruffle of the day was quickly smoothed, and his mind, fatigued by business or study, soon recovered its freshness and elasticity. The devotion with which he said the Office and the spiritual delight which he found in it, were visible. A priest, on a sudden influx of business, which he saw would occupy him through the whole day, exclaimed, "Thank God! I have said my Office." "I thank God," said Dr. Challoner, "that I have this pleasure to come."

This edifying incident shows that it is possible to discharge a daily task with joy and enthusiasm, even though weak human nature may be sorely tried by the exactions of an unvaried repetition of a particular duty, day after day.

It would be instructive to know how Bishop Challoner acquired the love and devotion which he experienced in the saying of the Divine Office. The knowledge would help us to understand why a priest, with business of moment crowding upon him, congratulated himself that the obligation to recite the Office was over, while Bishop Challoner, not less pressed by important matters, rejoiced that the duty was still before him.

We should likewise learn, as far as the Breviary is concerned, why some ecclesiastics often have the satisfaction of the priest in this story, while others feel as did Bishop Challoner.

Without doubt, the basis of the great joy of Bishop Challoner in reciting the Divine Office was the love of God which dominated his every thought, word and action. He loved God. He loved the word of God. He loved the Breviary, because it is rich with inspired texts of Holy Scripture, with stories of God's saints, homilies of zealous preachers and glorious hymns

of almost inspired singers. Yet the love of God would not alone be an adequate explanation. True and lasting love is possible only after the intellect gives the assurance that what is loved is worthy of being loved.

Bishop Challoner held the Breviary in high esteem because of the treasures contained therein. His love was based on knowledge and his knowledge was the fruit of careful, systematic and unfailing study of the Divine Office.

There is warrant for saying that the recitation of the Divine Office is a joy to one ecclesiastic mainly because he has made himself familiar with the Breviary, and a burden to another because he knows little of the contents of the precious volume. One understands the text; the other pronounces words with appreciation of what he is saying barely sufficient for the fulfilment of the obligation that rests upon him.

It is obvious that an understanding of the Breviary presupposes study of the sacred volume. The question, therefore, is pertinent: What amount of study to insure an intelligent and appreciative reading of the Breviary is expended by clerics before the burden of reciting the Divine Office is placed upon them? A look into the catalogues of a few ecclesiastical seminaries to find an answer to the question reveals no evidence that definite periods are assigned to the study of the Breviary. The evidence of many priests on the same point is that practically no attention is given to the Breviary until the reception of subdiaconate is impending. Then the *ordinandi* undertake the task of learning how to recite the Divine Office. Attention is concentrated upon the rubrics.

The inference from the absence in seminary programs of definite periods for the study of the Breviary, is that such study is not thought necessary. Apparently it is taken for granted that the course in Latin should enable students to read and understand the Breviary or any other Latin book. The ability to do so will be helped by the familiarity with the Bible which is acquired in the Scripture classes. This claim rests upon a solid basis. A student who devotes five or six years to Latin, and who during four years of theology uses the Bible, ought to be able to read the Breviary, if not as easily as an English text, at least with a fairly satisfactory understanding of the current Scripture, the homilies, the hymns and the Psalms.

That is the theory. What is the reality? Let those who are bound to say the Divine Office answer.

Without doubt there are many priests who read the Breviary with a thorough understanding and appreciation of all its parts. But is this true of the great majority of clerics? Will an examination of the *ordinandi* on the eve of ordination show that the young men have no trouble in translating the text? Will it leave doubts that they have a fairly adequate appreciation of the sense of the Breviary, even though they cannot translate its every passage?

If students ready for ordination fail in this test, if many priests candidly confess their limitations in the reading of the Breviary, due to inability to turn into English the Latin text, it would appear that the supposedly efficient training in Latin and the acquaintance with the Bible made in the Sacred Scripture courses do not enable those who are bound to the Divine Office to recite it properly. If these agencies fail, resort should be had to other means by which priests will be able to look upon the Divine Office with some measure of the interest and affection that Dr. Challoner had.

What suggestion can be made to bring about a more intelligent appreciation of the Breviary? One is that the study of the Breviary should begin during the first year in the preparatory school and continue in the higher seminary until the seminarian is ready for ordination. This attention, in every year, unless given in a perfunctory fashion, should familiarize priests with the Breviary so that they may read the Divine Office as readily as an English text.

Spiritual writers say much about the beauties of the Breviary. They declare it contains matter in abundance for sermons and for spiritual reading. An admirable volume, recently published, *With Jesus to the Priesthood*, says:

> The Divine Office is not a mere private prayer. It is a public prayer offered officially in the name of Jesus Christ. It is offered in His Name as a part of the eternal adoration that He brings to God, the Holy Trinity on earth as in Heaven.

Again the priest is told:

> The Psalms bring to me in the Office a divinely inspired formula of prayer that is at once personal and universal. Christian use

has transposed, transfigured, Christianized the Psalms and divested them of all that was narrow, local, transitory.

Now it is the human soul that utters the sublime thoughts of which they are composed, a human soul that God draws unto Himself as these prayers, so old yet ever new, ascend aloft and mount to His very throne.

Daily too I read the passages from Holy Writ selected as part of my official prayer. Again, before my eyes, God speaks and brings His creation into being; He breathes upon the waters; He ennobles man and woman and, when they fall, I hear Him promise a Redeemer, I wander with God's chosen people in the desert; I hear the prophets tell of that Messias who is to come. He comes at last and breathless I follow Him unto the Cross. With the great Apostle of the Gentiles, I see His Kingdom spread. Then with St. John I read the revelations vouchsafed to him of that Kingdom where the glory of the heavens is opened unto him.

Thus in my Office does the liturgical year help me to live again and ever the life of Christ, in prophecy, on earth, in eternity. Finally the lives of the Saints and the homilies tell me what that life, that all pervading spirit of Christ has accomplished in His chosen ones. They call me to rise and throw off my sluggish lethargy. And as I daily ponder, their words resound, echo and reëcho in my heart, until the joyous knowledge comes to me that so in truth I can and so I will serve God, for I am another Christ.[1]

Every one recognizes the truth of these reflexions, yet how can a cleric love and cherish these glories of the Breviary if he does not know the meaning of the words in which the marvellous beauties are enshrined? The conclusion is inevitable that, unless a worthy place is allotted to the study of the Breviary in the curriculum of preparatory seminaries and higher seminaries, clerics on the eve of receiving the subdiaconate will be ill-equipped to recite the Office "digne, attente ac devote", and the vast majority will discharge as a matter of routine the onerous duty which sacred Orders place upon their shoulders, and will partake little of the spiritual strength and refreshment, so rich and abundant in the vademecum of every priest.

The proposal that the study of the Breviary should begin the first year of the preparatory seminary and should continue

[1] *With Jesus to the Priesthood.* By Jules Grimal, S.M., S.T.D. Translated and adapted by Gerald Shaughnessy, S.M., S.T.D. Dolphin Press: Philadelphia. 1932. Pp. 550-552.

to the end of the theological course, might be made also concerning the Missal and the Ritual. The three sacred texts are in the hands of the priest day after day. Is it reasonable to expect that the celebration of Mass, the recitation of the Breviary, and the administration of the Sacraments will be fruitful in those graces without which there can be no truly priestly life, if there is little understanding and less appreciation of the truths enshrined in Missal, Breviary, and Ritual?

✠ PHILIP R. MCDEVITT,
Bishop of Harrisburg.

CONSUMING THE SACRED HOST.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In the May number of the REVIEW of this year, at page 539, I read in answer to "Kansas": "*All theologians* affirm that in order to receive the sacramental effects of the Holy Eucharist, a person must swallow the Sacred Host before it has been entirely dissolved in the mouth".

In view of this answer I wish to submit the following quotations: "Quidam veteres DD. et nonnulli, pauci equidem recentiores dicunt Sacramentum Eucharistiae gratiam conferre, dum species sunt in ore, antequam in stomachum traiiciantur". (*Tractatus De Sacramentis*, F. M. Cappelle, S.J., par. 419; 1928)—"Quid est manducare? Neque id plene constat. Dr. van Olfers existimat iam manducari quod ore excipitur. . . . bene vero, in morali existimatione, manducamus quod, in solido statu in os immissum, non nisi solutum et fortasse chemice mutatum deglutimus". (*Theologia Moralis*—Tomus III — A. Vermeersch, S.J., par. 415; 1923) — "Etiamsi SS. species in ore penitus pereant, sive hoc voluntarie causetur, sive dicatur semper accedere, non constat talem decoctionem cibi in ore factam non sufficere ad manducationem: sicut, e communi aestimatione, dicimur manducare panem, saccharum, etc., si ea deglutimus tantum postquam in ore substantialiter alterata fuerint". (*Institutiones Theologiae Moralis*—E. Genicot, S.J., par. 189, 7; 1923.)

D. J. DEW, M.S.C.

Douglas Park, N. S. W., Australia.

IS DIVORCE DECLINING IN THE UNITED STATES?

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Anent my "glaring" picture of the divorce evil, in which I "unfortunately" stopped with the statistics of the year 1929, I wish to add that 1930 merely confirms my conclusions. The actual annual decrease of 8,877 or 4.9% is offset by the parallel decrease in the number of marriages, namely 104,279 or 8.5%. Hence the actual *rate* of increase per thousand marriage was .7. If I remember right, the year 1926 was just as unusual as 1930. The only safe conclusions concerning divorce are those based on longer periods of time.

I am in favor of sunshine, provided it be not merely a cloud with a silver lining. My sincere hope is that Fr. Schmiedeler's rosy conclusions will be justified by time.

ALBERT F. KAISER, C.PP.S.

Cleveland, Ohio.

P. S. In the last decade the number of persons divorced in the United States was 3,617,200. A large percentage of these remarried, since only 1,062,726 are census residents.

HIS IPSE DIXITS.

The sacristy door slammed with a bang. The monsignor was not going to stay for Mass. He had come to the sacristy with fatherly anticipation to see his new assistant in action for the first Sunday, but he was so exasperated by the sermon that he could not calm himself sufficiently to follow the rest of the Mass. And now, back in the rectory, he tried to divert his mind by reading the Sunday paper, but none too successfully. Here he was, a pastor for thirty years, the patriarch of the parish, and in comes this young upstart from the seminary to tell him and his people that they are in the wrong, because they are not keeping step with the liturgical movement.

After his thanksgiving, Father Sylvester hurried to the rectory for lunch. He was a scholarly young man, with a sharp, *rubrical* eye and pince-nez perched impertinently on his classical nose. He was a little man with big ideas, a priest who had more liturgy than prudence. So far as he was con-

cerned, whatever declined from the spirit of the liturgy was anathema, and he anathematized it in his first sermon. He felt the victory was his, as he entered the living-room with a confident stride.

The monsignor, still sitting at the reading table, awaited him.

"Young man," he said very solemnly over his shoulder, as Father Sylvester entered the room, "this is a fine way to do things—insult me and scandalize my parish the very first Sunday. You can be sure that when the bishop comes for Confirmation, I'm going to tell him that he ought to be a little more careful not to ordain young men who drink in unsound novelties in the seminary."

The new assistant was nonplussed. Columbus, disgraced and in chains, after having discovered a continent, must have looked like that.

"Why, Monsignor," he fairly gasped, "what do you mean?"

"Just this," he said rather sternly, as he wheeled about and faced the young priest squarely. "What's the big idea of going into the pulpit and ranting for a half-hour about these new-fangled notions that some dried-up professors of liturgy concoct for their own amusement? The Catholic Church has existed and prospered with her system of piety for many centuries, and she doesn't need you callow seminarians to reform her."

Father Sylvester didn't intend to have anyone, not even a monsignor, walk over him when his beloved liturgy was assailed.

"Pardon, Monsignor," he began his defence in true seminarian style. "That the Catholic Church doesn't need anybody to reform her system of piety, *concedo.* That the utterly sentimental, empty devotions which I have witnessed in this parish since I came last Tuesday are the Church's system of piety, *nego.* The piety of the Church is the liturgy and the liturgy *only,* and some of these subjective methods of worship are just about as far away from the approved form as they can be without being condemned."

His Right Reverence was stunned.

"Well, now, I don't know about that," he said, regaining his composure. "The Church, the educator *par excellence,* has taught her children, besides the official worship of the liturgy,

a great variety of devotions which appeal more to the unlettered mind, or even to the current sentiments of the educated. And now do you mean to tell me that, because a number of fanatical liturgical revivalists have raised their voices in condemnation of 'subjective' devotions in public, dear old Mother Church, who has always loved and stooped down to the lowly and the simple, is going to stand by and bless them with papal bulls and declarations of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, while they condemn the poor people from the pulpit for praying the rosary during Mass, or doing other things just as harmless?"

"I may have been a little excited," Father Sylvester conceded, "but I didn't condemn anybody. Really, it's not liturgical. I told those people that the best thing they can do is to put aside their beads and pray the Mass with the priest. It's not the devotions we're objecting to, at least not all of them, but it's the abuse of disturbing the liturgical acts. And as a matter of fact, Monsignor, we have been blessed with papal bulls and official declarations on this point. So we can hardly be called fanatical, considering the fact that we're in good company. You know what Pius X thought about this matter, not to mention other popes. This was the Church's way of doing things in the very beginning, and this has been her principle ever since. She was wise enough to see that for so universal a thing as public worship she must have a language objective enough to be unhampered by the bonds of time and place and accidentals, and so, with the prudence that comes down from the Father of Lights, she chose God's own words from Holy Scripture. But some people don't scruple at trying to improve anybody's methods, not even those of the Holy Ghost."

The new assistant was well pleased with his rendition. Dr. Pius Parsch, in his most eloquent mood, he felt sure, never surpassed it. The old pastor said not a word.

Father Sylvester was determined to make a clean breast of it all.

"And that singing. . ." he continued.

"What about it?" the monsignor demanded hotly, now put on the defensive.

"It's a distraction to man and a disgrace before God," answered the young priest, with more liturgy than prudence.

"Just how do you manage to muster up that condemnation?", asked the old pastor, plainly nettled.

"Well, your choir may be all right for a country dance, but they don't know the first essentials of Gregorian chant. They kept grinding out those unliturgical songs [the strongest censure he could think of on the spur of the moment] that had nothing to do with the Mass at all. I was so rattled I felt like throwing a vase of those atrocious artificial flowers at them. It would have been good riddance for both."

"Young man, that is enough. Do you realize that you are directing this insolent language against a pillar of the diocese? Just why do you think I was made a monsignor?"

"Well, Monsignor," Father Sylvester replied with studied diplomacy, after a telling pause, "that's not hard to answer at all. A number of things have merited the distinction. First of all, there is the beautiful church and the school you built. They're among the best in the diocese. And then you're an organizer. Your thriving societies are the admiration of every parish. But, Monsignor," he added wickedly, "I'm sure you weren't given the purple because of your loyalty to the Church's liturgical traditions." Here Father Sylvester smiled benignly over his glasses at the pillar of the diocese, as he continued, "We always used to say back at the seminary that if you had shown as much interest in the liturgy as you have in building and social activities, you'd be an authority on the subject."

"When I was in the seminary," put in the monsignor, "I was second to none in rubrics. Of course, we didn't have all the chances you youngsters are getting. Educational standards are much higher nowadays, when they have this liturgy down to a scientific basis. And then, too, I'm getting older. And I'm not as proficient as I used to be."

"You're right up to the mark in rubrics, Monsignor," Father Sylvester observed apologetically, this time with more prudence than liturgy. "You have impressed me that way ever since I came." The new assistant would hardly have taken an oath on that statement. "But then, you see," he continued, "rubrics and liturgy aren't the same thing, as you well know. What we're trying to do,"—the young priest's voice was taking on a professional air—"we're trying to get

the common people to live with the Church, as the clergy is supposed to do. As Saint Peter says, 'You are a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation.'"

Here the housekeeper stuck her head into the room nonchalantly.

"Monsignor," she called shrilly, "I sorta think it's the bishop who wants to talk to you over the 'phone."

The old pastor jumped up quickly and hurried across the living-room to the office. He knew how much certitude Hilda had when she "sorta thought" something.

"Good morning, Your Excellency," he greeted.

"Good morning, Monsignor. I just called to inquire about the young man I sent you fresh from the seminary," he explained. "He's a little wild-cat, when he wants to put a point over," he continued. "Splendid young man, though. He has a headful of good ideas. It's boys like him, just coming out, with a good, solid training, that will mean much to the diocese. I thought you'd like him, because he's so thoroughly interested in the liturgy. What do you think of him, Monsignor?"

"Just a moment," the monsignor excused himself. Stealthily he crossed over to where he could see his new assistant sitting at the dining-room table, taking a little lunch. Very gently the old pastor pulled the office door shut. "Your Excellency," he whispered enthusiastically, "he's the salt of the earth!"

The bishop chuckled heartily and hung up the receiver. The monsignor went over to the dining-room.

"Ahem!" he grunted, stretching his neck and swallowing something that wasn't there. "The bishop just phoned, Father, and insists that I keep a vigilant watch over your bright ideas. He says that you have a bad habit of trying to run things. By the way," he added, lighting a Murad, "this liturgical movement that they're endorsing nowadays is going to be a big help for the Church, if *we* get at it in the right way. I was just thinking how wonderful it would be if the lay people would know the deep meaning underlying it all. I suppose we could have special instructions for the parish, couldn't we?"

Father Sylvester jumped up from his chair and almost choked on the last dry bite of his breakfast roll. The young priest smiled his very best liturgical smile.

"Why, Monsignor," he cried in boyish glee, when the bite of pastry had reached its destination and cleared the single track to his voice box, "when do we start?"

GILES STAAB, O.M.CAP.

Victoria, Kansas.

REDUCTION OF MASSES "PRO POPULO".

Qu. Under our former bishop certain parishes or rather their pastors were exempted from the obligation of the *Missa pro populo*, in virtue I suppose of a special indult from the Holy See. Some priests maintain that the privilege ceased with the death of our former bishop. Others assert that it still holds, since it was not "personal" but "local"; in other words the privilege was granted, not to the bishop, but to the small parish or the pastor of it, in order to exempt him from a *grave incommodum*, and that it still obtains under our present bishop.

1. Is every priest in charge of a parish (irrespective of his title —parish priest, pastor, rector, or administrator, and irrespective of the size and revenue of the parish) bound *sub gravi* to say the *Missa pro populo?*

2. Does the exemption mentioned above and granted by personal letter to the pastors of small parishes survive the bishop's death?

Resp. 1. That our American parishes are *de facto* canonical parishes in the strict sense and that their rectors are pastors, has been repeatedly shown in previous Conferences; likewise that these pastors are obliged to say the *Missa pro populo.* For the fuller treatment of this question our inquirer is referred in particular to the Conference entitled "Parishes Without Boundaries".[1]

This obligation binds *sub gravi* and *ex justitia.* Neither the small size of the parish nor its meagre revenues will *per se* excuse the pastor from this obligation. It is just for cases of this latter kind that the Holy See sometimes reduces the number of days on which according to canon 466, § 1 the *pro populo* must be said. Shortly after the Code went into effect the late Cardinal Gibbons sought and by a rescript of the Consistorial Congregation of 5 December, 1919, received for

[1] ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, LXXXIII (1930), 391-397. Cf. also "'Pastor' and 'Rector' in *The Official Catholic Directory*," *op. cit.*, LXXX (1929), 417-418; "The Obligation of Pastors of National Parishes to Apply Mass 'pro populo'", *op. cit.*, LXXXIV (1931), 78-79.

all the Bishops of the United States a faculty to dispense from that obligation for five years. When this expired it was renewed, but it was this time committed to the Apostolic Delegate in the following rescript of which His Excellency has very graciously supplied this copy:

C. CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS

Beatissime Pater,

Petrus Fumasoni-Biondi, Archiepiscopus Tit. Diocletanus atque Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis Delegatus Apostolicus, nomine Episcoporum ditionis suae humiliter postulat ut pro illis ecclesiis, quae, ad normam Can. 216 ad statum paroeciarum evectae, carent mediis necessariis ad divinum cultum rite servandum et ad sacerdotem sustentandum, praesertim ob exiguum et instabilem numerum fidelium; liceat—firma parochorum obligatione *pro populo* litandi—hujusmodi Missas ad regulam in Can. 306 statutam reducere.

Ex Audientia Sanctissimi, diei 20 Junii 1924.

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster PIUS PP. XI, audita relatione infrascripti Cardinalis Sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis Secretarii, Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis Delegato Apostolico benigne indulget ut Ordinariis praedictis facultatem tribuere valeat Missas a parochis *pro populo* applicandas, pro sua conscientia et prudentia reducendi ad normam Can. 306, favore illarum paroeciarum quae in circumstantiis supra expositis versantur, iisdemque perdurantibus.

Praesentibus ad quinque annos valituris, contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

P. CARD. DE LAI, *Epus Sabinen., Secret.*
H. J. CICOGNANI, *Substit.*

L. S.

When this rescript of 20 June, 1924, expired, it was again renewed for five more years by another rescript of the Consistorial Congregation dated 13 November, 1929.[2]

In virtue of the rescript still in force the Apostolic Delegate confers upon the local Ordinaries at their request the power to dispense the pastors of poor parishes so that the latter are

[2] Here it is well to call attention of pastors that these rescripts do not directly grant them leave to omit the Mass *pro populo* on any of the days determined by canons 466 § 1 and 339, viz., on all Sundays and holidays of obligation even if suppressed. An "Index Festorum in Universa Ecclesia Suppressorum" was published by the Congregation of the Council under date of 28 December, 1919—*Acta Ap. Sedis,* XII (1920), 42-43.

released from the obligation of applying the Mass *pro populo* on the days prescribed in canons 466 and 339; and remain obliged to apply the Mass *pro populo* only on those feasts enumerated in canon 306.

2. In the first place it is not correct to designate this reduction a "privilege" or an "exemption". The faculty was conferred upon the Ordinaries formerly by Cardinal Gibbons, now is conferred by the Apostolic Delegate, in virtue of the respective indults of the Consistorial Congregation. The Ordinary, then, by a dispensation which he grants to the individual pastors of poor parishes, reduces the prescribed number of Masses.

This dispensation has a *tractus successivus*, i. e., it is not exhausted by one act but is employed in repeated instances of the obligation from which it frees. Now canon 86 states that such dispensations do not lapse except first by the certain and total cessation of the motivating cause for which it was granted. If then the financial and economic condition of the parish improves, the dispensation does not cease, unless that improvement takes it completely out of the class of "poor" parishes.

The dispensation granted the pastors in question did not lapse at the death (or other loss of office) of the former bishop, unless the latter had limited it by some such phrase as "ad beneplacitum nostrum".[3] But it is hardly likely that the Ordinary placed such a restriction on his dispensation.

A greater difficulty of another nature is raised by the fact that, as the inquirer states, the dispensation was "granted by personal letter". The difficulty here is not whether the dispensation ceased with the death of the bishop who granted it: it did not, unless it were granted with such a restrictive clause as "ad beneplacitum nostrum". The question now being considered is whether the dispensation was "personal" or "local". If the dispensation was granted rather to the then incumbent of the parish, it is personal and benefits only him: when he vacates the office for any reason whatsoever, the dispensation does not benefit his successor.[4]

[3] Cf. canon 86 compared with canon 73.

[4] Neither would such a personal dispensation as a rule benefit the pastor to whom it was granted, should he be transferred to another parish, since usually that dispensation will have been given only in view of the condition of his former parish.

If, however, the bishop's letter clearly indicates that he dispenses not so much the pastor actually incumbent at the time, but rather the pastor incumbent at any time as long as the conditions of the parish continue,[5] then the dispensation might be called "local", in the sense that it benefits not only the pastor holding the parish at the time the letter was issued, but all his successors until the conditions are fully improved. If the import of the bishop's letter is doubtful in this respect, it will have to be considered "personal", on the strength of canon 50, since it is among those that "adversantur legi in commodum privatorum." Without knowing the exact tenor of the bishop's letter it is not possible to determine its extent and limitation. But with these distinctions every pastor ought to be able to estimate its force.

These distinctions show how important it is for Ordinaries to make points of this kind clear beyond dispute.

BAPTISM OUTSIDE OF PROPER PARISH.

Qu. Authorities allow a new-born babe to be baptized in the parish where it is born (Parish A), even though its parents have their domicile in a distant one (Parish B). The case is practical, for many such come into Parish A where there is a hospital, while their home is in a neighboring parish miles away. Granting this old ruling also to be true with the new Code, the following questions arise:

1. Should the record of Baptism be kept in baptismal books of both parish A and B?

2. In case the pastor A baptized the child in his church, must he also send notice to pastor of parish B, according to Canon 778? If yes, must this notice be a baptismal certificate with all the usual data of the baptismal record or a simple notice of the fact of baptism of N.N. the daughter or son of N.N.?

3. In case such notice is to be sent to the pastor of parish B, what is that pastor to do with the notice—enter it in the baptismal book, same as the usual record (this comes to the same as question No. 1); or simply enter it in the Liber Status Animarum?

4. Could the pastor of parish A, after baptizing the child, consider himself independent of canon 778 (as far as notification is concerned) because authors say that "in ordine ad Baptismum" he has equal rights with pastor of parish B?

[5] E.g. by stating that he dispenses the pastor of this parish.

5. What is to be done in case of "private" baptism by pastor of parish A, where there will be obligation of *supplying* the ceremonies? May they be performed in parish church A or must they be performed in parish church B, always presupposing that the child and mother have not yet returned to their own parish B? Or must the pastor of parish A tell the mother that, while he was allowed to baptize with private baptism in case of danger of death at the hospital, yet now that the child is baptized they must wait for the *supplying of ceremonies* until they get back to parish B.

Resp. Before proceeding to answer the questions proposed here, it is necessary to call attention to the fact that the supposition stated in the introductory paragraph of the above is far from correct. Canon 738, § 2 states that even a *peregrinus* is to be baptized solemnly by the proper pastor in his own parish, if it can be done easily and without delay. Therefore even if a child is born in a hospital situated within a parish other than the proper parish of its parents, it is *per se* not the right of the pastor in whose parish the hospital is situated to baptize the child solemnly. This right belongs even in such an instance to the proper pastor of its parents. Only if it cannot easily or without delay be brought to its proper pastor may any other pastor baptize it solemnly.[1]

If, then, the child cannot easily and without delay be brought to its proper pastor for solemn baptism, any other pastor [2] may baptize it solemnly in his own parish. In such a case:

1. The record of the Baptism must be kept in the parish where the child is actually baptized (canon 777, § 1).

2. Canon 778, which our inquirer cites, makes it evident beyond the shadow of a doubt that the pastor who has baptized a child not belonging to his parish is obliged to inform its proper pastor; and if it has several proper pastors, not anyone of the them, but the one who is proper by reason of its (i. e. its parents') domicile.

Neither canon 778 nor the Roman Ritual prescribes in detail what form this notification should take. Neither do authors discuss it. Strictly speaking, a simple notice with only those data that are necessary to identify the child would satisfy the

[1] Cf. "Right to Baptize solemnly children born in hospitals," ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, LXXX (1929), 512-514.

[2] Not necessarily the one in whose parish the hospital is located (cf. canon 738 § 2).

letter of the law. But pastoral courtesy would call for more complete information of all the data which the Ritual prescribes to be recorded.

3. There is no obligation on the part of the child's proper pastor to enter the record of its baptism in his baptismal register; neither does it seem proper to do so. He would fully satisfy the law if he entered the child in the *Liber Status Animarum.*

4. Whatever the authors may have held before the Code, what our inquirer assigns as the reason for his fourth question is certainly not true after the Code. Canon 738 does not confer "equal rights" with the child's proper pastor upon, e. g. the pastor of the parish within whose limits the child is born. Only when the difficulty or delay that would be involved in bringing the child to its proper pastor would excuse from this, could another pastor lawfully baptize it solemnly.

Whatever reason justifies a pastor in baptizing a child that does not belong to his parish, he is bound by canon 778 to inform its proper pastor of its baptism. It is impossible to see why the present inquirer would flaunt the clear law of canon 778 because of some opinion expressed before the Code; which opinion is in manifest contradiction to the law then prevailing in this country, as stated in the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore.[3] It is repeated in canon 778 with explicit provision for exceptional cases.

5. If one other than the child's proper pastor has privately baptized the child in question, it would seem that the pastor of the hospital has no right to supply the ceremonies. It is only urgency that warrants the pastor of the hospital to baptize solemnly a child not belonging to his parish (canon 738, § 1). But once the child has been baptized, there is no longer any urgency for supplying the ceremonies after private baptism. Therefore, as a rule, the pastor of the hospital would, it seems,

[3] *Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis II, . . . Acta et Decreta,* (Baltimore, 1868), n. 227. Cf. A. Sabetti, *Compendium Theologiae Moralis,* (16. ed., New York, 1902), n. 658, Dico 1°. The opinion to the contrary expressed in the *casus conscientiae,* "Where ought a New Born Baby to be Baptized?" (*Homiletic Monthly and Catechist,* IV [1904], 558-560), while based on good authorities, was even then at variance with our particular law laid down in the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore; whatever its value at that time, it certainly is superseded by canon 738, when this latter is interpreted in the light of canon 6 n. 1.

not be justified in supplying the ceremonies over that child. In exceptional cases, however, he might do so, e. g. if the child is so far recuperated that it could be brought to his parish church, though not to its own proper church, and there is still danger that it may die before it could be brought to its proper church, or if it will have to remain a very long time in the hospital. It is true enough that these ceremonies are not necessary for salvation. It is also true that it is fully justifiable to delay supplying them longer than to postpone baptism itself. Still the church desires that these ceremonies be supplied after private baptism. Where danger of death or otherwise the necessity of a very long delay in supplying those ceremonies is present, the rights of the proper pastor should yield in this matter also to the good of the child to be derived from the ceremonies.

The foregoing holds of course only for the case that the private baptism was certainly valid. If, however, it were doubtful, then there would still remain the more urgent obligation of procuring the certain validity of baptism for the child: in such a case the reasons which according to canon 738, § 2 would warrant the pastor of the hospital to baptize solemnly a child not of his parish but born within its limits would also justify his rebaptizing it conditionally, and then he not only may but also ought to supply the ceremonies as prescribed in the Ritual for solemn conditional rebaptism.

PASTOR'S JURISDICTION OVER PARISH SOCIETIES.

Qu. Does it come within the jurisdiction of the pastor to determine how the income of Catholic societies is to be expended?

Resp. To answer this question it will be necessary to distinguish—1. societies of Catholics which have not obtained any formal approval of the Church; 2. such societies as have been erected with ecclesiastical approval.

1. LAY SOCIETIES. If a society of Catholics has not obtained any formal approval of the Church, it is in the canonical sense merely a *lay* society, not an ecclesiastical society. *A lay society* as such does not come under any special jurisdiction of the Church and governs itself (speaking in general) with-

out any special supervision of the Church. It will also be entirely free to dispense its income as it sees fit, independently of all ecclesiastical approval. Two restrictions must, however, be placed on the foregoing. (a) Even if banded together into some kind of association not formally approved by the Church, Catholics still remain under the jurisdiction of the Church, not so much as a society, but rather as individual members of the Church. (b) If the income of such society is obtained only from the contributions of the members, the ecclesiastical authorities have no jurisdiction whatsoever over such revenue: it must be considered merely as the property belonging to private individuals who are free to distribute their own goods and even without any further ecclesiastical supervision than the faithful are subject to in virtue of canon 336. But if property accrues to the *lay society* through donation, bequests, etc., for charitable and religious purposes, the Ordinary is specially empowered to supervise the execution of the will of the donors and therefore even the *lay society* will be obliged to render an account of its management of the property and the fulfilment of the will of the donor or testator (canon 1515). A classical example of such a *lay* association is the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, which has indeed received the highest praise and recommendation from many local Ordinaries and even from the Holy See but which has never been accorded that canonical approval that would erect it into an ecclesiastical society in the strict canonical sense. And when the Bishop of Corrientes in Argentina asked the Holy See in how far the Society of St. Vincent de Paul is subject to the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary as regards the matters laid down in canons 684-699, the consultor of the Congregation of the Council showed that that society was not an ecclesiastical society in the sense of those canons, since it never had received formal erection into a moral person; and that as a society it was therefore not under the special jurisdiction of the local Ordinary described in those canons, but only under that of canon 336 to which all the faithful are subject. The Congregation of the Council replied in conformity with this *votum* of the consultor: that the bishop should be informed that the Ordinary has the right and the duty of watching over that society and of seeing to it that nothing is done contrary to faith or

morals and, if any abuses occur, of correcting and suppressing them.[1]

2. ECCLESIASTICAL SOCIETIES. Those associations which have been erected into moral persons are more properly called ecclesiastical societies and come, more strictly than those spoken of above, under the special jurisdiction of the Church, as laid down in canons 684-719. But even these societies govern themselves and in particular employ their resources (from whatsoever source they may be derived — dues, donations, legacies) as they see fit within the limits of their own statutes and the intention of donors, testators and the like. It is therefore not the province of the ecclesiastical authorities to decide or even to approve how the society's moneys should be employed. That is left entirely to the decision of the society, in conformity with its statutes. Only when the latter requires the approval of the Ordinary (as is sometimes prescribed for certain more extraordinary transactions), has the Ordinary a final voice in these matters, and even then it is usually not the right of positive determination but only of approval or disapproval. Over and above this the ecclesiastical authorities have also a special right and duty of supervision. This does not empower an Ordinary to impose his decision in such matters upon the society, but rather it authorizes him to see to it that in administering and employing its property the society acts in accordance with its constitutions, the laws of the Church and the will of the donors, testators, etc.

But where does the pastor come in? *Per se* he has absolutely no jurisdiction over any society, whether lay or ecclesiastical, that may exist entirely or in part as a conference, court, etc., in his parish, except in so far as all Catholics of the place come under his care. In particular his office as pastor does not carry with it any power over the management and disposition of the property belonging to such societies. And the latter are not bound even to give him an accounting, much less to obtain his consent for any of its business. Whatever ecclesiastical jurisdiction the society is subject to is vested in

[1] S. C. C., *Corrienten.*, 13 Nov. 1920—*Acta Ap. Sedis*, XIII (1921), 135-144. Whether our American fraternal organizations belong to the same class of societies is not possible to determine without a fuller knowledge of their foundation and approval.

the Ordinary. By way of delegation, however, the Ordinary's jurisdiction may to a greater or lesser degree be committed to the pastor. In some cases this delegation will be made explicitly either by special letters or by diocesan statute. To some extent it may also be implicit, especially in the case of strictly parish societies, though even for these the statutes of many dioceses make express provision. And the pastor's powers over such parish societies will have to be gauged by his letters of delegation, or by the diocesan statutes, or by custom.

What then will be the pastor's right over the disbursements of parish societies? If the society is canonically erected (as very few are; since without delegation from the Ordinary the pastor cannot erect them into moral persons), then in one or the other way the Ordinary usually commits his jurisdiction over the parish society to the pastor. The latter then will not have absolute power to "run" the society and its business as he pleases: he will have only the overseeing. He could prevent only such things as would be contrary to the statutes of the society. Thus, if an altar society — even if organized among the members of one parish—were established for the benefit of any church, neither the Ordinary nor the pastor could prevent it from donating vestments, etc. to any church which the society chose to help. If, however, the altar society were established only for the benefit of the one parish, then the society could not lawfully donate its services, etc. to any other church, unless the Ordinary or (if he be empowered to make exceptions) the pastor consent to this departure from its statutes. A lay society could make exceptions from its constitutions without the consent of the Ordinary or the pastor, since its constitutions are in force only by the will of its members. And neither Ordinary nor pastor could hinder any such departure except in one case, viz. if the society had obtained its resources by donation, legacy, etc. with the stipulation that they be used for, e. g. this one parish: use contrary to such stipulations would be a diversion which the Ordinary, or by delegation from him the pastor, not only could forbid, but also would be obliged to forbid, since the change of the will of testators to pious or charitable causes is reserved to the Holy See, unless the testator has expressly empowered the Ordinary to make the change (Canon 1517).

Beyond such restrictions in the constitutions or the provisions of special stipulations, neither the Ordinary nor the pastor may prevent a society from using its moneys, etc., as it pleases. And this is true whether the society be a mere lay society (in the sense that it has not been canonically erected into an ecclesiastical society) or whether it be an ecclesiastical society formally approved by competent ecclesiastical authority.

"BUNCHING" LOW MASSES INTO HIGH MASSES.

Qu. N. has received sixty dollars as the stipends for sixty low Masses for a recently deceased member of his parish. As is his wont in such cases, instead of saying sixty low Masses, he sings ten Masses, which according to the usual stipend of the diocese make up the equivalent of the total sum for the sixty low Masses. This practice is made possible by constant admonitions from the pulpit by which the faithful are strongly warned that they have no right to dispose of these intentions, but that the pastor alone can handle the matter. The parishioners criticize him, claiming that even the Mass is a question of money and consequently they are losing faith in the Holy Sacrifice. Again, other priests, having no intentions, are forced to go out begging for them from their brother-priests.

Can such a practice be called an abuse? If so, what am I to do in order to stop it?

Resp. Is this an abuse!!! In the first place, by singing one high Mass for every five or six low Masses for which he accepted the stipends, N. does not fulfill all the obligations he has assumed. Even though it is a high Mass, it satisfies but one intention and he is still obliged to say as many other Masses as are necessary to complete the number for which he accepted stipends. Neither can N. justify his course by the view expressed in these pages on another occasion regarding the lawfulness of singing high Masses to fulfill the obligation of a large bequest.[1] As that case presupposed, there was first no explicit or equivalent declaration of the testator requesting as many Masses as there were dollars (the usual stipend for low Masses in this country) set aside for this purpose in the will; only then was appeal made to a probable interpretation of the mind of the testator. But N. received not merely so many dollars for Masses, but so many dollars for so many

[1] ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, LXXIV (1931), 521-522.

Masses. In his case the will of the donors is evident and he has no right to cumulate the stipends for several low Masses and apply but one high Mass. To speak frankly, N. is guilty of injustice; and even though through ignorance (!) he might have been excused from sin, he is nevertheless an unjust possessor of the stipends for which he has not said the requested Masses. He is obliged either to restitution or to have the remaining Masses said.

Canon 828 requires that as many Masses be celebrated and applied as stipends, even though small, were given and accepted. And canon 825 n. 3 states it is never allowed to accept a double stipend for the application of one Mass. How seriously the Church regards these rules can be seen from canon 2324, which authorizes the Ordinary to punish all who violate these ordinances, according to the gravity of their guilt: if circumstances warrant it, the priest can be suspended or even deprived of his benefice or office. In view of the aggravating circumstances of the scandal that this pastor is giving, he ought to be canonically warned with the threat of one of these penalties and, if he does not make amends, his bishop would be justified in suspending him or even in removing him from his parish.

What wonder the faithful are scandalized? This word is used advisedly, not in the sense of their being shocked, but in its strict theological signification. The mercenary shepherd is become not merely the hireling who deserts his flock and leaves it to the ravaging wolves, but is himself become the devouring wolf that destroys the flock.

It is arrogant for any pastor to assert that his parishioners may not give the Masses for which they themselves make the offering or for which they have recived an offering from their friends, to other priests of their choice, but must deliver them up to him alone. There is no law that obliges them to give these stipends in either case to any determined priest.

One other unfortunate result, though of minor importance, is that other priests in less favorable circumstances lack sufficient intentions for their daily Mass. But why recall a lesser duty of charity, when N. is guilty of injustice?

What can our inquirer do to put a stop to this abuse? That will depend upon his position. If he is the N. in question,

he is bound to make amends in the various ways in which he has been guilty and to have the remaining Masses said. If he is N's local Ordinary, he may use his jurisdiction to compel N. to fulfill all his obligations, not only in the future, but also those he has neglected in the past, invoking, if necessary, the power granted him in canon 2324. If he is N's confessor, let him recall the offender to a sense of his duty, even denying him absolution if he obstinately refuses to make amends. If he holds no authority over N, let him shape his course as prudence dictates.

PROSCRIPTION OF A PERIODICAL.

Qu. Can a periodical be placed on the Index? How?

Resp. Canons 1395-1405 speak only of books as being the objects of the ecclesiastical prohibition. But canon 1384 § 2 states that the ordinances of all the canons of that title XXIII concerning books apply, unless the contrary is evident, also to periodicals. As a matter of fact the daily known as *L'Action Française* was placed on the Index by decree of the Holy Office, 29 December, 1926.[1]

To have a periodical placed on the Index, it will be necessary to bring it to the notice of the Holy Office together with copies of at least some of its issues. It would be well for the informant to add his reasons for asking the Holy See to examine and proscribe the periodical, as is directed in canon 1397.

What our inquirer has in mind is probably whether a local Ordinary could prohibit a periodical and, if so, how he should proceed. From the second part of canon 1395 § 1 it is certain that particular councils as well as individual local Ordinaries can forbid pernicious periodicals, but only to their subjects. If any Ordinary would use this power, he should proceed with the utmost caution. He would do well to imitate the practice of the Holy Office and direct several competent critics to examine the periodical individually and to make a report to him; then have these reports compared by the same body of men or by others and only when he is convinced that the

[1] *Acta Ap. Sedis*, XVIII (1926), 529-536; cf. *Index of Prohibited Books*, (Vatican City: Vatican Polyglot Press, 1930), p. 4: also p. XXIX-XXX.

periodical merits condemnation and its prohibition is opportune, should he take the necessary steps. He may announce his prohibition in any manner he sees fit, and add the sanction of such penalties as the case seems to warrant.

COPE AT EXPOSITION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

Qu. Is it necessary to wear the cope when exposing the Blessed Sacrament for Holy Hour, or is it sufficient to don the cope just before the Benediction? This question has a very practical bearing in hot weather.

Resp. Decree 3697, 12 of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (enacted 7 December, 1888) states that in exposing or reposing the Blessed Sacrament it is enough to wear surplice and stole. But the cope is necessary for the Benediction: "Si agatur de expositione et repositione SS. Sacramenti sufficit ut Sacerdos cotta et stola sit indutus; nunquam cum alba, cingulo et stola tantum. In processionibus et benedictione cum SS. Sacramento in ostensorio impertienda, omnino requiritur ut celebrans pluviale et velum humerale induat."

KNEELING AT THE "ET INCARNATUS EST" DURING MASS.

Qu. In the April number of the REVIEW the question of kneeling during the singing of "Et incarnatus est" is again brought up, and your questioner states that because of being censured by fellow priests he consulted various ceremonials only to find that all say that the people and servers kneel during the singing of these words. May I suggest that he consult Baldeschi, Part I, Chap. I, Art. 2, No. 4? And inasmuch as he has referred to Fortescue, may I ask him to read closely Fortescue's *Ceremonies of the Roman Rite*, Chap. II, page 89 (at foot), where he will find the following: "They [the choir] do not kneel, but uncover and bow, while *Et incarnatus est* is sung"? I do not lay any claim to being a rubricist, but I have a very distinct recollection of the practice of kneeling during the singing of these words being chanted during my seminary days, on the strength of a decision of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. That was in the very early years of this century. In my parish, during the twenty-odd years I have been here, the people have always remained seated during the singing of these words, except on the Feast of the Annunciation and the Feast of the Nativity. My difficulty now is this. Many of my people go to high Mass occasionally in such centres as New York, Chicago and St. Louis, and other places

nearer home, and they find the practice at home differs from that which they see abroad, and of course what is done in the bigger centres must be right. Should I fall in line, so to speak, with the practice in other places, even though it is a custom contrary to the Rubrics, or shall I continue to be an "odd fish"? I wonder if there are many parishes, or even dioceses, in the United States in which the contrary custom has prevailed for "forty years".

BARBARUS.

Qu. In your answer on page 429 of the April REVIEW, concerning the kneeling at the *Et incarnatus est*, you seem to retreat from the stand you took in your article on page 308 of the September REVIEW, 1928. Your article of the September REVIEW, 1928, is as follows: "The practice, introduced into this country during comparatively recent times, of kneeling during the chanting of the Credo when the choir sings *Et incarnatus est* should be abolished as contrary to the rubrics." On page 430 of the April REVIEW, 1932, you wrote, "Nevertheless, it would be exaggeration to condemn the contrary custom. Canon 27 of the Code admits that a legitimate custom of forty years' standing may dispense from a general law of the Church," etc. Your words in the 1928 REVIEW, "comparatively recent times," are wrong, because forty years surely cannot be called comparatively recent times.

I have been asked by visiting priests who assisted here at divine services, why my altar boys and parishioners do not kneel during *Et incarnatus est*, and I pointed to your article in the September REVIEW of 1928. They told me I was wrong because I am going contrary to the custom of the country. Am I wrong in following out your article on page 308 of the September REVIEW of 1928? I have been using your article of 1928 as a foundation in my arguments.

W. VA.

Resp. Fortescue is accurate in the statement which he makes in the last lines of page 89 and first line of page 90 (*The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described*, third edition, of 1930, Chapter XI): "They (who are in the choir) sit as soon as the celebrant does so (after he has recited the Credo). They do not kneel, but uncover and bow, while *Et incarnatus est* is sung." The decrees (1594 and 3860 ad 2um) of the Sacred Congregation of Rites which he invokes, are very clear. Let us quote decree 1594, of 13 February, 1677: "Ad versum, Et incarnatus est, etc., omnes, nec excepto Episcopo, teneri genuflectere, quandocumque stantes incidant in illa verba,

Et incarnatus est, tum si ab ipsis ore proferantur, tum si a cantoribus cantentur; vel etiam si sedeant, in ipsa Nativitatis die, necnon in festo Annuntiationis B. Mariae Virginis. Ceteris vero diebus indiscriminatim sedentes omnes, nemine excepto, teneri caput detectum inclinare."

Nevertheless, on 17 September, 1897, by its decree 3965 ad 1um, the same Sacred Congregation approved the contrary custom of the diocese of Autun in France: "Consuetudo antiqua, de qua in casu, servari potest."

This is the reason why THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW of April 1932 deemed it necessary to mitigate the rigor of a previous article in September 1928. We should not be more Roman than Rome itself. A long custom ("consuetudo antiqua") may legitimize the practice according to which ecclesiastics present in the sanctuary and the laity sitting in the pews kneel whenever at high Mass the words *Et incarnatus est* are sung.

Now, how many years are necessary that a custom may prevail against a law of the Church? This question is authoritatively settled by the Code, canon 27, § 1: "Juri divino sive naturali sive positivo nulla consuetudo potest aliquatenus derogare; sed neque juri ecclesiastico praejudicium affert, nisi fuerit rationabilis et legitime per annos quadraginta continuos et completos praescripta." A prescription of full forty years' standing is sufficient to create a legitimate derogation to a positive law of the Church.

May a parish, independently of the remainder of the diocese, be a subject canonically able to originate a legitimate custom? This question, debated by canonists, is answered affirmatively by Vermeersch-Creusen's *Epitome Juris Canonici*, tomus 1us, edition of 1929, page 99 (about the middle): "Capax consuetudinis est universa Ecclesia, dioecesis, Capitulum, Ordo religiosus, provincia, monasterium sui juris... Plerique excludunt paroeciam: rationem exclusionis fatemur nos non videre."

As in such matters a solid probability suffices to justify a course of action, we repeat the conclusion which we have already expressed, viz.: the custom followed by the people of a diocese or even of a parish, of kneeling while the words *Et incarnatus est* are sung, may be kept if it has lasted for forty years.

LITURGICAL MELODY OF "ITE, MISSA EST" OBLIGATORY.

Qu. Some priests sing occasionally at high Mass the liturgical melody of the *Ite, missa est* as contained in the Missal; at other times, just from indolence, etc. they omit it and replace it by a *recto tono* execution. Some others, who sufficiently well intone the *Gloria* and *Credo*, do not take the trouble to learn the liturgical melody of the *Ite, missa est*, and use only the monotone. Is that allowed?

Resp. The liturgical melodies of the *Ite, missa est* and of the *Benedicamus Domino*, contained in the Missal, have the same obligatory character as those of the various Prefaces, of the Pater noster, and of the intonation of the Gloria and Credo. All these liturgical melodies are to be found in the official "Ordo Missae" and "Canon Missae". Therefore they are imposed by the following words of Pius V's Bull printed on the first page of every Missal: "In virtute sanctae obedientiae praecipientes, ut Missa juxta ritum, modum ac normam quae per Missale hoc a nobis nunc traditur, decantent ac legant."

The monotone or *recto tono* execution is tolerable only when the celebrant is quite unable to learn or render the prescribed melody.

DISTRIBUTING COMMUNION FROM BOTH ENDS OF SANCTUARY RAIL.

Qu. A priest distributes Holy Communion beginning at the left and continuing the distribution in both directions. Does he violate the rule?

Resp. In distributing Holy Communion the priest must begin at the Epistle end of the railing, according to the formal direction of the *Rituale Romanum* (edition of 1925), titulus IV, caput II, No. 4: "Postea (Sacerdos) ad communicandum accedit, incipiens ab iis qui sunt ad partem Epistolae." This rubric implies that the distribution of Holy Communion should not be continued in both directions. After giving Communion to one line of communicants, from his own left to his own right, the priest should come back to the Epistle side and then start the next line.

RELIEVING A PRIEST WHO IS GIVING COMMUNION.

Qu. A priest comes into the sanctuary and relieves at the altar rail the priest distributing Holy Communion. What genuflexions should be made?

Resp. When a priest comes into the sanctuary in order to relieve at the altar rail another priest distributing Holy Communion, he should make a genuflexion on both knees toward the ciborium held by him who is giving Communion. Afterward he should genuflect on one knee toward the tabernacle before ascending the steps of the altar; then open the tabernacle, genuflect again on one knee, take the extra ciborium, open it, genuflect, and go straight to the railing to relieve the other priest. See Wapelhorst, eleventh edition, No. 97, 2 and 4; and No. 182, 2 and 3.

ONE OR MORE LIGHTED CANDLES WHEN TABERNACLE IS OPENED.

Qu. Must there be one or more lighted candles when the priest opens the tabernacle to take the Blessed Sacrament for Communion to the sick? Is there any difference in this respect if the ciborium is not opened because the Host is already in the pyx?

Resp. There should be two lighted candles on the altar whenever the priest opens the tabernacle to take the Blessed Sacrament for Communion to the sick. (Concilium Plenarium Baltimorense II, decree 264, and Rituale Romanum, tit. IV, Cap, II, No. 1: "Accensis cereis . . . tabernaculum aperit, genuflectit, extrahit pyxidem.")

This rubric must be observed even when the Host is already in the small pyx that is being used to carry Communion to the sick person.

GENUFLEXION WHEN KISSING BISHOP'S RING.

Qu. At the commencement exercises of a Catholic high school the graduates genuflected on left knee when kissing the archbishop's ring. A discussion arose among the clergy present as to whether one should genuflect on right or left knee when kissing a bishop's ring. Kindly settle this dispute.

Resp. Genuflexion on one knee must always be made on the right knee. See Wapelhorst, eleventh edition, No. 97: "Genuflexio fit aut unico aut utroque genu. Unico genu flectitur demittendo genu dextrum usque ad terram juxta talum pedis sinistri, et surgendo sine mora." It would seem awkward to bend the left knee.

GLORIA AND CREDO AT NUPTIAL MASS DURING OCTAVE OF SACRED HEART.

Qu. At a nuptial Mass on 7 June of this year (1932) which was fer. 3 infra Oct. Sacr. Cordis Jesu, semid., a priest sang the Gloria and Credo. Now in the Monita of the Ordo regarding the "Missa votiva pro Sponsis" we are told: "Haec Missa dicitur sine Gloria et sine Credo." Nevertheless the priest claimed he had to say the Gloria and Credo because of the Octave of the Sacred Heart. Is he correct?

Resp. Even during the privileged octave of the Sacred Heart ("octava privilegiata tertii ordinis") the Missa votiva pro sponsis is a Missa votiva privata. "Haec Missa, etiamsi solemniter celebretur, est Missa votiva privata," says accurately Monitum VIII, No. 2, of the Baltimore *Ordo*. Now, according to the "Rubricae Generales Missalis," VIII, 4: "In Missis votivis non dicitur Gloria in excelsis, etiam tempore paschali, vel infra Octavam, nisi in Missa beatae Mariae in Sabbato, et Angelorum: et nisi Missa votiva solemniter dicenda sit pro re gravi vel pro publica Ecclesiae causa, dummodo non dicatur Missa cum paramentis violaceis."

In regard to the Credo, Rubric XI (last lines) tells us that the Credo is said in solemn votive Masses "pro re gravi" and therefore should be omitted in all private votive Masses.

Criticisms and Notes

JESUS CHRIST: SA PERSONNE, SON MESSAGE, SES PREUVES. Léonce de Grandmaison, S.J. Edition Abrégée. Gabriel Beauchesne, Éditeur. Paris, 1930. Pp. viii+707.

The present work is an abridgment of the large two-volume study that appeared at Paris in 1928, a year after the distinguished author's death. Père Grandmaison was eminent in two fields that admirably combined to make him a most useful laborer in the vineyard of the Lord. One field was apologetics and the volume which is here noticed sums up the work of a life of study and research. The other field was in the guidance and direction of souls who came to him not only from various places in France but also from over the seas, England and America. Of this work there is no human account; but its record will stand forever in the mind of God who rewards His servants in due time.

The work of Père Grandmaison entitled *Jésus Christ* is not a new biography of Christ but an apologetic study of the sources of the life of Christ and the problems that surround the personality and the work of Christ.

A brief summary of the contents gives the best indication of the considerable matter covered in this volume. It is divided into six books. The first considers the sources of the history of Jesus, non-Christian and Christian. The second book is entitled "Le Milieu Evangelique." The third deals with the message of Jesus, the fourth with His person, the fifth with the works of Christ, and the last book treats of the religion of Jesus Christ.

The subjects of some of the chapters gives some indication of the wealth of matter. Among others: in the first book we have a discussion of the synoptic problem and the questions concerning the fourth Gospel. The political, social and intellectual background of the Gospel message is discussed in the second book. In the third the economy of Christ's message, and that message itself, with its characteristic insistence on the Fatherhood of God, the Kingdom of God and the commandment of love, are considered.

In the fourth book there is a chapter on the witness of Christ to Himself, a chapter on the person of Jesus, sections of which are devoted to the religion of Jesus, the conversation of Jesus with His brethren, and the inner life of our Lord. A third chapter in this book treats of "The Problem of Jesus. Solutions and the Solution". Here the problem is studied from the modern, liberal Protestant and rationalistic point of view, with a concluding section of "The Mystery of Jesus".

The fifth book is divided into four chapters dealing with Divine signs in general, the prophecies of Christ, the miracles of Christ and the Resurrection. In the second chapter a portion is devoted to the eschatological problem.

The sixth book gives first the origins of Christianity and the religion of Christ to the end of the Apostolic age. The second chapter summarizes the witness to Christ in antiquity, the Middle Ages, and in modern times.

Limited as the treatment of so many and such varied aspects of so great a subject must be in this abridged edition of a larger work, it nevertheless presents a profound, lucid and unified apologetic for and portrait of our Lord. The table of New Testament texts used and the index at the back are useful additions to a truly fine work.

This volume cannot be too highly recommended for those who wish to learn of or appreciate more deeply the breadth and depth of Jesus in His person, His doctrine, and His kingdom, the Church.

THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL MANIFESTO. An Interpretative Study of the Encyclicals "Rerum Novarum" and "Quadragesimo Anno" of Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XI. By Joseph Husslein, S.J., Ph.D., Dean, School of Sociology, St. Louis University; Author of "Democratic Industry," "The World Problem," etc. Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee. Pp. 328.

One of the lamentable tendencies in social life is that which leads men to serve immediate interests and to overlook general philosophy in which alone the separate interests of life find their relative values and law of coördination. This process finds a parallel naturally enough in personal life. Health, learning, power, pleasure, wealth are separate human interests whose value is determined by their relation to personality, cultural integrity and spiritual destiny. The average mind is so obsessed by enslavement to interests and so deluded by indifference to philosophy that we are compelled to face gigantic social problems with the feeling of helplessness. On the one hand there is no general accepted philosophy in which men take refuge. On the other hand the penalties of this fractioning of life are found in the distracting problems that now engage the imagination of the world.

Perhaps these statements overlook a feature of social life that involves the most stubborn of all problems. In fact no individual can live without a personal philosophy. No social interest attains to place and to developed power without involving a philosophy. The employer has his philosophy. The laborer has his philosophy. The

leader in finance, the journalist and the political leader, actually develop philosophies of which their own interests are the centers. And in this way ultimately conflicts of interests are conflicts of philosophies.

This is the difficult situation which the Catholic Church faces as it undertakes to carry on its divine mission to humanity. We find in her philosophy an inclusive view of human life and of all human interests. The spiritual dignity and destiny of man, the reality of spiritual truth, the authority of moral law, the sanctions of justice and the obligations of power in the composite of social life are axioms in the philosophy of the Church, surrender of which is unthinkable.

If the Church were to confine herself to mere abstractions, her task would not be so difficult. Her solicitude for human life, the imperative demands of her divine mission in the world urge her to bring the principles of her philosophy as near as possible to the actualities of life. A most impressive illustration of this is seen in the Encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI which are the basis of the volume that prompts the writing of these lines. Leo XIII brought social conditions to judgment before the bar of Christian philosophy. Piux XI does the same thing in the light of the development of forty years. Neither of the Pontiffs spoke or acted under impulse. No unrestrained idealism leads them to overlook the limitations of life and institutions. No timidity in the presence of organized social interests leads them to give secondary attention to the authentic demands of spiritual and social truth that finds so much that is wrong, lamentally wrong, in social life.

Dr. Husslein draws on Social History, Social Problems and Social Philosophy; on Radicalism, the Structure of Industry, Christian Idealism, and many forms of social conflict in order to give background to the two great Encyclicals; to describe the social policies favored in actual conditions and to indicate adjustments among these policies in view of varying conditions in national life. Reference is made throughout the text to sections of both Encyclicals as the topic in hand invites. Full texts of both are published as an Appendix. They are paragraphed and numbered in a way to make reference easy.

It is, of course, possible for a priest to develop a mistaken personal philosophy as he understands his relation to social justice and his obligation to interpret the mind of the Church, within the sphere of his influence. But the philosophy of the Holy See gives us an interpretation to which no priest may be indifferent. Dr. Husslein quotes on page 254 of his *Christian Social Manifesto* the following words of Pope Benedict XV: " Let no member of the clergy imagine

that such activity is outside his priestly ministry on the ground that it lies in an economic sphere. It is precisely in this sphere that the salvation of souls is in peril. Hence it is our desire that priests regard it as one of their obligations to devote themselves as far as possible to social theory and action, by study, observation and work, and that they support in all ways those who in this sphere exercise a wholesome influence for the good of Catholics." And Pope Leo XIII is quoted from his *Rerum Novarum* as follows: "Every minister of religion must bring to the struggle the full energy of his mind and all his powers of endurance."

The priest who accepts this philosophy as his own will find Dr. Husslein's work an admirable guide. The lucid arrangement of material, the coördination of principle with problem, and the exposition of social policies as these express the mind of the Church, leave nothing to be desired. One can hardly give attention to the larger aspects of the development of Catholic social thought in the United States without recalling the superb work of Dr. John A. Ryan, whose unceasing activity by voice and pen prepared the way as brave pioneers do for the development of thought and literature, in the record of which Dr. Husslein's volume now takes a permanent place.

CURSUS PHILOSOPHICUS THOMISTICUS. By Joannis a S. Thoma. Nova Editio a P. B. Reiser, O.S.B. Tomus Primus; Ars Logica. Marietti, Rome. 1930. Pp. xxvi+839.

The method of revealing the mind and presenting the teachings of Aquinas has varied according to the needs of the various generations of the last six hundred years. At one time it is the commentary which best renders service; at another period it is the synopsis; at another it is the restatement of the Thomistic mind in the language of the age. It can be said that Thomistic literature in general is concerned mainly either with an attempt to analyze the text of Aquinas or with an effort to restate his "mind" in an original way. Occasionally, but rarely, both of these purposes are combined. The *Cursus Philosophicus* of John of St. Thomas is of the latter class.

This noted Thomist was born in 1589 at Innsbruck, although he was of Belgian ancestry, as indicated by his name, John Poinsot. He died in 1644. He lived therefore when Thomism is supposed to have been at a low ebb. Whether or not this be true, it is certain that John of St. Thomas ranks among the greatest Thomists of all time. It is doubtful whether he was surpassed by anyone in ability to grasp the "mind" of St. Thomas from a comprehensive

study of all phases of a question and in all the works of Aquinas. It is certain that he was surpassed by no one in ability to restate clearly and accurately the "mind" of Aquinas for the needs of his particular time. Even in the field of Logic, with which this first volume is concerned, his talents in these directions are very evident. Philosophers of Neo-Scholastic loyalty find in this giant of the schools a striking realization, in the seventeenth century, of the methods of the new movement. That is what makes the appearance of a new edition of his works especially timely.

The new edition of the *Cursus Philosophicus* has been demanded for some time. Not only were the older editions scarce; they were also very inaccurate. Father Reiser, O.S.B., has done a great work well in the first volume. It is hoped that he will give to us soon the other two volumes of the *Cursus Philosophicus* and that he will then turn his attention and masterful scholarship to the *Cursus Theologicus Thomisticus* of the same author.

READINGS ON THE FAMILY. Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B., Ph.D. The Century Company, New York. The Century Catholic College Texts. Pp. 525.

This is a companion volume to the compiler's *Introductory Study of the Family*, to which attention was called in our issue of May, 1931. Recognized authorities are drawn upon from readings that touch the wide range of fundamental problems which center on the family. Dr. Schmiedeler groups the contents under three general headings: Family Integration, with seven readings; Family Disintegration, with twenty readings; Family Reintegration, with sixteen readings. Nearly fifty writers are drawn upon, all of them recognized in the field of social studies. Fourteen of those represented in the work are Catholic. Dr. Schmiedeler includes the entire text of the recent Papal Encyclical on Marriage. He has drawn his readings from a large range of sources and places them at the service of his reader as though he brought a library to the side of one's easy chair.

It is remarkable that the singular prominence taken by the family in Christian life and doctrine is not reflected in our Catholic literature. Social processes are constantly undermining the Christian family as regards the theory of marriage, mutual obligations among the married, relations of parents and children. Both positive studies of these processes have been notably lacking among us. Of the entire number of readings in the volume there are only five by Catholic writers that are fact studies as distinct from the statement of doctrine.

The editor was governed in his choice of readings by the fact that they were intended as supplementary to his volume on the family. But the work can well stand on its own feet without support from the other volume. It contains a range of information and interpretations bearing on the family that no thoughtful observer will wish to overlook. An inquiry directed to the editor brought out the information that he had been unable to obtain permission in this country or in Europe to include a number of readings which he thought important. One may well hope that he will continue his work in the field and succeed in bringing to attention of the readers of English much that is contained in foreign literature.

LA DEFENSE DE L'INTELLIGENCE. By Abbé Henri de la Selle. Pierre Téqui, Paris. Pp. 189.

This small volume is concerned with the paradox furnished by many modern and contemporary movements that pledge themselves to intellectualism and at the same time belittle the dignity and functions of the intellect. The author covers in five short chapters great stretches of ground. He explains in a popular way the nature of intelligence, and the right of the Church to stand in defence of this faculty. Another chapter presents a summary of the struggles of the Church in defence of intelligence in Patristic times. Here the author makes an interesting excursion into the problem of the relation of dogma to reason. Thomism, represented by Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas, is explained as the medieval answer of the Church to the thirteenth century attacks on the supremacy of intelligence. Here the author gives a passing glance at the Scholastic doctrines of matter and form, the principle of contradiction, the principle of identity and the extent of causality in their relation to the problem of intelligence. The concluding chapter of the book is a study of the vicissitudes of intelligence in many modern religious and social movements beginning with the Reformation and concluding with Modernism.

The author has done a service for preachers not only in concisely meeting the task he places on himself but also in presenting a method that is of great profit to the people and to the pulpit to-day.

LA SPIRITUALITE DES PREMIERS SIECLES CHRETIENS. Par Marcel Viller, S.J. Paris: Bloud & Gay. 1930. Pp. 189.

While of course formal treatises on mystical and ascetical theology are hardly to be found before the age of the Victorines in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it would be erroneous to assume that there

was nothing of the nature of a theology of mysticism or asceticism anterior to this date. Since, from its very nature, mystical and ascetical theology can only be a development of the fundamental spiritual dogmas of the Gospel, it follows that there must have been a traditional mysticism and asceticism from the remotest Christian ages.

It is to outline this traditional spirituality in its varied forms that Père Viller has contributed this volume to the "Bibliothèque Catholique des Sciences Religieuses." With the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles as his starting-point, the author goes forward through the ages of the martyrs, discussing martyrdom and virginity, then through the early Patristic period. There follows a brief analysis of Egyptian monachism, the teaching of the Cappadocians and the expansion of the religious life into Syria and the West. Two chapters are devoted to Greek and Latin mystical writers, such as Pseudo-Dionysius, Augustine and Gregory the Great. The two final chapters are devoted to sanctity outside of the religious life, and the prayers, devotion and works of piety of the period.

Clearly, so vast a panorama cannot be condensed into so few pages without considerable sacrifice of detail, but Père Viller has given a splendid analysis which can serve as an important introduction to the entire field of early Christian spirituality.

SECULARISM IN AMERICAN EDUCATION: Its History. By Burton Confrey. The Catholic Educational Press, Washington, D. C. 1931.

Dr. Confrey defines a secular school rather more broadly than a school for training in the various lay activities of life under state or lay authority, by adding that "religious instruction may be permitted in a school and yet it may be called a secular school, if its aims and curriculum are predominantly secular or non-religious". Indeed, this definition is broad enough to include some Catholic institutions, especially professional colleges. With this definition in mind, the author notes the genesis of the secular idea in our schools, denominational in origin, and traces the growth of the secular idea in customs, constitutions, and statutes. His is a difficult and decidedly valuable study in both interpretation and content. And the breadth of his researches as indicated in notes and a comprehensive bibliography, which incidentally he knows how to use and cite in a scientific way, give the reader a sense of confidence in the painstaking character of the work.

The first chapter deals with "Historical Antecedents" in England, where Protestantism became taught in the public schools and where

teachers were licensed by ecclesiastical authorities. There is a curious slip in view of Archbishop Laud's execution in 1645: "In 1663 we read of Archbishop Laud's demand that Christopher Sands, who taught an English school in Londonderry, be sent to London for trial; he was accused of being a Jew and of having denied Christ" (p. 8). This is followed by an excellent account of the Congregationalist schools of New England—schools which taught sectarianism with a vengeance, manned as they were by nominees of the governing theocracy. In the Anglican colonies, schools and teachers were Episcopalian, with popular education and schools by dissenters long delayed. In Pennsylvania, there was a great degree of freedom, and here was established the first non-sectarian college, the later University of Pennsylvania.

With this introduction, the author takes up each state alphabetically and prints excerpts from the constitution and statutes prohibiting religious tests, sectarian instruction in public schools, appropriations to religious and private schools, sectarian text books and the like. It will be seen in certain states that Bible reading is required, in others permitted without interpretation, and in others forbidden. Some of these prohibitions date almost back to the sectarian conflict against semi-established church schools in the 'forties. Others reflect the anti-Catholic hostility of the Know-Nothings and the American Protective Association. Some were written into the laws for reasons of toleration, while others are colored with intolerance. Together with the analytic chart and an interpretative chapter, this section is most valuable as a reference.

One would like to see a similar synopsis in a study of teacher requirements in our state and public schools, with special reference to questionaries calling for religious data from the applicant. New York has recently decreed that such information can no longer be required of applicants for positions in the public schools. In some state universities, religious affiliations of students are no longer demanded on registration. While this matter does not pertain to Dr. Confrey's study, it might make an interesting and quotable little brochure.

FAMILIA VETERIS FOEDERIS. A. P. Thoma Villanova Gerster a Zeil, O.M.Cap. Marii E. Marietti, Taurini, Italia. Pp. 263.

This book is a reprint of a number of lectures on the Old Testament delivered by Father Thomas, O.M.Cap., while lecturer in Sacred Scripture and Theology in the Province of Tyrol. The volume is crowded with texts from the Old Law and also contains many interesting facts drawn from several outstanding works on

Scripture and Archeology. The Latin used by the author is simple and the contents of the work are set forth in logical order.

The book is divided into three main parts dealing respectively with the family of the Old Testament (a) in itself, (b) in its relation to God, (c) in its relation to others. To the student of the family the first part of the work is the most interesting. Particularly instructive are the sections therein dealing with matrimonial laws, espousals, and the celebration of marriages. Laws relating to matrimonial impediments, polygamy, divorce, and marital fidelity are treated in considerable detail. Only seven or eight of the 263 pages deal with the education of children.

There are many topics treated in the book which, though interesting in themselves, have only an indirect bearing on family life. The author makes little or no effort to point out even their indirect relation to the Jewish domestic world. This is particularly the case with the sections dealing with agriculture, forms of government, and even religious cult and customs.

INSTITUTIONES LITURGICAE DE RITIBUS ORIENTALIBUS. Johannes Michael Hanssens, S.J. Tomus II: de Missa Rituum Orientalium: Pars Ia (xl+514 pp., Rome, 1930); Tomus III: de Missa Rituum Orientalium: Pars altera (xii+646 pp., Rome, 1932); Appendix: Indices et Versiones (120 pp., 1932). (Rome: Gregorian University, 4 Piazza della Pilotta).

It is a real pleasure to announce these volumes, a most careful work of the learned Professor of the Gregorian University and of the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies. Beside the volumes described above, Fr. Hanssens plans to publish a General Introduction to the Oriental Rites (T. I: De Ritibus Orientalibus universim), a study of the Sacraments and Sacramentals (T. IV: De Sacramentis et Sacramentalibus Rituum Orientalium), and of the Canonical Hours (T. V: De Officio Horarum in Ritibus Orientalibus). When complete, the work will be a veritable encyclopedia of the Oriental liturgies, even a mine of information about the Oriental Churches, if the author does in the forthcoming parts what he has done in these volumes on the Mass. For the two volumes on the Mass and the Appendix to these volumes published to date give the reader all he may wish to know about the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice in the Eastern Churches, describing not only the present use, but also the history of the various rites and ceremonies, so that the author is led to discuss a multitude of points of dogmatic, historical, and canonical interest, and therefore gives us far more than one might expect from the title. The method followed by the author is perfectly clear, as

it should be in a text book, even if the result is monotony in the presentation—a thing hard to avoid under the circumstances. In each instance we find, stated briefly but clearly, the use of the various Rites at the present time; then comes a historical section, more or less developed according to the importance of the question in which the particular point is studied in the light of history. This gives the reader the means of understanding the development of the liturgy and the meaning of the present usage. Thus in Vol. II, which has for its subject matter the Mass in general, there is a long chapter "De Materia Sacrificii Eucharistici": Chap. VII, pp. 121-271. Art. I treats "De Pane Eucharistico" (pp. 121-217): under the heading "De Materia e qua Panis Eucharisticus conficiendus est", we find first the "usus praesens", p. 122, followed by the "Historia", pp. 123-125; then comes "De Azymo et Fermentato": pp. 125-127 = "usus praesens", pp. 127-141 = "Historia" followed by a long section on the many controversies between the Byzantines and the Latins and in the Eastern Churches themselves "super compositione panis eucharisicti", pp. 141-169. After an Appendix "De Chaldaeorum Nestorianorum Fermento Sacro", pp. 169-174, we have "De Forma et Figura Panis Eucharistici": pp. 174-178 = "usus praesens", pp. 178-180 = "Historia"; next "De Nomine Panis Eucharistici", p. 181 the "De Numero Panum in Celebranda Eucharistia Adhibitorum": pp. 182-185 = "Usus praesens", pp. 185-200 = "Historia"; "De Consecratione Particularum", pp. 200-203 = the present usage, pp. 203-206 = the history of the question; "De Praeparatione Panis Eucharistici", pp. 206-211 describe the present use, the history following, pp. 211-217. The other element of the Holy Sacrifice, the Wine, is treated in the same elaborate manner: II, pp. 217-271. This fulness of treatment gives to our author the opportunity of gathering the texts of ancient writers according to which some heretics of old used water instead of wine, and of examining the theory of Harnack attributing the same usage to the orthodox before the fourth century (pp. 223ff.).

Among the sections of historical character which are of special interest may be noted that on the Agape in the Orient (II, pp. 271-304), the relation of the Last Supper and the Holy Eucharist to the Jewish rites of the Passover Meal—the author follows the generally received view that our Lord celebrated the Jewish Passover—(II, pp. 407-418). Of special appeal to the theologian will be II, pp. 68-80 on the sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist according to the testimony of the Ancient Eastern Church.

Volume III takes up the different parts of the Mass according to the same method: we are told first of the use followed in the various Rites at the present time, upon which comes the historical

development: v. g., "De Ritibus Praeparationis: pp. 1-3 = usus hodiernus, pp. 3-7 = historia; De Manum Lotione: p. 7-8 = usus praesens, pp. 8-11 = historia; and so on for every individual part of the Mass.

The work is thus by no means one that should appeal exclusively to liturgists, to those comparatively few liturgists who are interested in Oriental questions. As noted already, over and above its immediate liturgical interest, Fr. Hanssens's work is a mine of information for the theologian, who will find here abundant material which he can use in the tract on the Holy Eucharist, for the historian of the Church and the canonist as well.

The value of the work is enhanced by an excellent bibliography — prefixed to vol. II, pp. XXI-XXXIX — which receives copious additions in the text itself as the author supplements it generously in connexion with the individual questions. The authorities, quoted profusely, are reproduced in the original languages (Greek, Old Slav, Coptic, Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, Armenian, etc.), and the longer quotations are translated especially in the Appendix volume.

The volumes are printed with a remarkable degree of correctness, which deserves special recognition, as the many different languages used in the books must have made the task of printing rather difficult. The misprints, rather few altogether, have been corrected for the most part in the Addenda et Corrigenda to the two volumes, so that very seldom has a mistake like that on p. 199 (vol. II) escaped the watchfulness of the author (text = Syros Chaldaeos similem usum pro lege aliquando habuerunt: where evidently the nominative case is required: Syri Chaldaei).

We can only wish and hope that it will be granted to the author to carry out his plan in full and that the other volumes may be published soon.

Literary Chat

As a supplement to Vol. XXIII of the *Revista di filosofia neo-scolastica*, a volume of 395 pages commemorating the centenary of the death of Hegel has been issued by the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart at Milan. Hegel died in Berlin on 14 November, 1831, being a little over sixty years of age. Fr. Augustine Gemelli, O.F.M., Rector of the University, explains why a Catholic University has undertaken to issue a volume commemorative of a Pantheistic philosopher, the great representative of Monism and Modern Idealistic Immanism. The first reason was to bring vividly to the Neo-scholastic mind the significance and influence of Modern Idealism. Then the implications of Hegelianism are here brought out in full light: contradiction raised to a system, the raising to the level of divinity what is not divine, resting all in process or becoming, the destruction of the foundation of morality, and setting up the absolute state.

Essays have been contributed by able philosophers of various nations. We note the very able historical and analytical study of *Hegelianism in America* by the Rector of the Catholic University, Monsignor James H. Ryan. We congratulate the University of the Sacred Heart on this important work, for, especially when compared with the effort of the State University of Milan on the same subject in the *Rivista di filosofia*, we see in this volume a triumph of Italian Catholic scholarship.

The Rev. P. R. McCaffrey, O.Carm., has written a history of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Newark that reveals a story which begins in turmoil and distress and ends with impressive achievements worthy of the constant traditions of religious. The community is now active in England, Scotland, Italy, Alaska, Canada and in the American dioceses of Seattle, Newark, Trenton, and Philadelphia. It counts twenty-five foundations and three hundred sixty-four members. It conducts schools, hospitals, homes for the blind, working girls and orphans.

The typical history of the community begins in 1888 with a general assembly in Nottingham, England, under the direction of Bishop Bagshawe. From that date the community developed under high ecclesiastical approval and the activities mentioned above resulted, evident signs of the blessing of God.

The earlier epoch in the life of the organization is not pleasant reading. In 1884 Bishop Bagshawe received into his diocese a Poor Clare nun who wished to found an order to care for working girls. She had been Miss M. F. Cusack and was known as Mother Clare. She was a convert with a very independent spirit. Lack of insight into the spirit of Catholic religious life prepared her poorly for her intended work. She often said that she "knew little about the doctrine and practice of the Church". She was released from her vows as a member of the Poor Clares and began her duties with full approval from Bishop Bagshawe and Cardinal Manning. The new community was known as The Institute of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace. Financial difficulties developed. Mother Clare came to New York for the purpose of securing help. She made a very unfavorable impression there and she determined to make a foundation in New York City, quite in conflict with her mission. She failed. The trouble caused by this effort reacted on the community in Nottingham. Mother Clare succeeded in winning approval from Bishop Wigger of Newark, for the opening of a home for immigrant girls in 1884. Her personal qualities betrayed her into many mistakes, chief among which was defiance of authority, and finally she apostatized. With the 1888 reorganization in Nottingham this early period is ended and the edifying work of the Sisters begins. (*From Dusk to Dawn*; Benziger Brothers; pp. 300.)

A new volume of sermon notes is added to the growing list of works that we have from Father Michael Andrew Chapman. (*For Days and Seasons*. Notes for Occasional Sermons; pp. 345; B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis.) The outlines are intended for holidays of obligation, Advent, Lent, civil holidays (or the Sundays nearest to them), May and October devotions to the Blessed Virgin and November devotions to the Holy Souls, twelve Meditations for the Holy Hour, one for each month, are included. The statement on page 235 in the Sermon for Decoration Day that "The Name of God figures in the Constitution" is not accurate, unless it refers to the fact that the signature of Washington is dated "in the year of our Lord". The name of God occurs in the first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence and human rights are set forth as conferred by the Creator. Father Chapman's outlines are very practical and suggestive.

The Rev. Joseph A. Newman has brought out a new Catechism in which he sets forth Catholic belief and practice in the simple language that makes appeal to children. (*Catechism*, Large Size; pp. 159; Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee.)

The text consists of brief direct statements followed by short questions related to them. Perhaps one who uses Father Newman's text will wish to add a word of explanation of the power of the Church to grant dispensations from disciplinary laws. In treating the law of fasting (page 68, n. 208) reference is made to dispensation from its observance. However, in n. 217, no mention is made of dispensation in case of mixed marriage. The text states simply that the Church forbids Catholics to marry non-Catholics. Morning and Evening Prayer, an Examination of Conscience and many hymns are included by the author. The Introduction is written by His Excellency, Bishop J. A. Floersh of Louisville.

A short life of *Catherine Tekakwitha*, Lily of the Mohawks and the St. Lawrence, by Edmund Lecomte, S.J., who has devoted many years to the study of her extraordinary life, has been translated by Sister Francis and edited by Father John J. Wynne, S.J., who writes a short preface. (Tekakwitha League, 141 East 29th Street, New York City; pp. 190.)

The story is one of extraordinary interest from a human standpoint, and one of superb attraction from a spiritual point of view. One is carried back to the days of martyred missionaries, and Indian ferocity in private and in war. Out of that background arises the serene figure of Tekakwitha, who is well worthy to stand among the saints. She was born of an Iroquois father and Christian Algonquin mother in 1656. Disfigured by smallpox, she developed a retiring spirit and became skilled in many kinds of handwork. She first met the Jesuit missionaries in 1667 and was strongly attracted to the Faith. Her baptism in 1676 at the age of twenty brought a marvelous response to its graces—and persecution from her associates which followed it became a channel of grace. She escaped to Sault Saint Louis Mission in 1677. There her faith blossomed into extraordinary beauty. She made her first Communion after long delay, as was the practice with converts at the time. Her later life is one of continued consecration to God. She was permitted by her director to make the vow of virginity in 1679. One is held spellbound by the account of penances, prayer and spiritual maturity by which Tekakwitha's life was enriched. She died after much suffering in 1680. Many evidences of her heroic virtue and miraculous intervention are given in the concluding section of the life. The cause of her Beatification is now under way.

A report received recently by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, on the work of cataloguing the Vatican Library calls attention again to the inexhaustible riches of the Library and the service to international scholarship rendered by the Endowment in financing the work. The Vatican authorities are coöperating in a manner that wins greatest praise from scholars throughout the world, as are The American Library Association and the Library of Congress. The Librarian of the latter has deposited with the Vatican Library its own great card Catalogue.

As an illustration of service now possible the Report mentions an Italian scholar who asked the Vatican Library for a list of all of the editions of the works of the poet Aristo and offered to pay for copying it. By the use of a machine presented by the Carnegie Endowment in 1929, photostat copies of cards listing 188 editions of the poet were prepared in half an hour at a cost of twenty-seven lire. Ultimately the entire Vatican Catalogue will be at the service of scholars everywhere. The centuries have accumulated in the Vatican an almost incredible treasury of books, manuscripts, incunabula, letters and other documents which when made known and accessible will invite the attention of historians throughout the world of scholars. The generosity of the Church authorities together with the resources of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the highly technical skill demanded in the vast work of cataloguing, promise

a service that will promote the international understanding and accord for which the world hopes in all fields of human interest.

A priest who desires to go through a soul-searching course of spiritual reading will find an opportunity to do so by taking up in the English translation by Mrs. Rodolph Stowell of *The School of Jesus Christ*, by Père Jean Nicolas Grou, S.J. (Pp. 458. Introduction by Dom Roger Hudleston of Downside Abbey; Benziger Brothers, New York.) Father Grou was born in Calais in 1731. He made his first vows as a Jesuit in 1751 and final vows in 1766. On account of the tribulations to which the Society of Jesus was subjected at the time, he lived for a while at Lorraine, but when the suppression affected that district he went to Holland, returning to Paris in 1776. He went to England in 1792 and died there in 1803. The restoration of the Jesuits in England occurred in 1801. He renewed his vows shortly before his death and was called to his reward after much suffering. Father Grou was a prolific and scholarly writer. *The School of Jesus Christ* is rated as one of his best works and it was highly approved by four theologians whose judgment was asked by the Archbishop of Dublin.

The work covers practically the whole field of personal spirituality as it rests on the teaching of Christ. All doctrinal exposition is related to believing and living in Him. The intense and thorough personal mastery of our Lord's teaching and appeal to which Father Grou attained, is evident in every page of his work and this gives to it its soul-searching quality. Probably the troubled times in which he lived and the disintegration of religious ideals so widely observed, gave him a more vivid imagination than is now usual and made him a bit pessimistic in some ways. Pages 24 to 36 show this in the analysis of the corruption of the human heart from childhood to maturity. The obligations of charity toward those in need includes the duty of looking for them (p. 78). The duties of renunciation are universal, absolute, continuous (p. 86). Righteousness is luminously treated (pp. 124 ff.). The mission of truth is extended to war against our prejudices, which rest on illusions of sense, imagination, mind and heart (pp. 142 f.). A spiritual interpretation of the Our Father occupies 45 pages. One who reads Father Grou's work as a pupil in the school of Christ will find spiritual enrichment that offers abundant compensation for the effort. Father Huddleston's Introduction contains a good sketch of the author, his times and his writings.

The Society of St. Gregory of America has published, in a second edition, a White List of Music approved and recommended by it. The list occupies thirty large pages. In addition, rather as a preface to the list, the texts of twenty-one Papal Documents on Sacred Music are reproduced. With this rich storehouse of information on hand one can easily know the mind of the Church and find guidance in one's choices of Sacred Music.

Reflections on the Litany of the Sacred Heart, by the Rev. Raphael V. O'Connell, S.J. (Apostleship of Prayer: 515 East Fordham Road, New York City; pp. 237), contains thirty-three brief studies of the invocations of the Litany of the Sacred Heart. They are calculated to serve priests and religious in their instructions and meditations, not only at times of special devotion, as the month of June, but also at the Forty Hours' Prayer and similar Eucharistic appeals throughout the year. Father O'Connell makes his exposition, covering the entire range of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart, particularly attractive by varied illustrations, without however obscuring the doctrinal simplicity of his subject. Apart from his object of fostering private devotion, he keeps his readers mindful of Christ the King's social reign, which the Church seeks to increase among the faithful at large, and in which the appeal to the Sacred Heart is calculated to find ever-renewed impulse.

Books Received

LITURGICAL.

INSTITUTIONES LITURGICAE DE RITIBUS ORIENTALIBUS. Ioannes Michael Hanssens, S.I., in Pont. Universitate Gregoriana et in Pont. Instit. Studiorum Orientalium Professor. Tomus II: De Missa Rituum Orientalium, Pars Prima. Pp. xl—514. Pretium, 25 *L.* Tomus III: Pars Altera. Pp. xii—646. Pretium, 35 *L.* Appendix ad T. II et III: Indices et Versiones. Pp. 120. Pretium, 5 *L.* Romae: apud Aedes Pont. Universitatis Gregoriana. 1932.

THE WORDS OF THE MISSAL. By C. C. Martindale, S.J. Macmillan Co., New York. 1932. Pp. 224. Price, $2.00.

MASS SERVING. By the Rev. Peter C. Yorke, S.T.D. Textbook Publishing Co., 21 Washburn Street, San Francisco. 1932. Pp. 55. Price, $0.35.

ORDO DIVINI OFFICII RECITANDI Sacrique Peragendi juxta Kalendarium Ecclesiae Universalis pro Anno Domini 1933. Marius E. Marietti, Taurini, Italia. 1932. Pp. 119. Pretium, 3 *L.*; 100 exemplaria, 200 *L.*

HISTORICAL.

THE HISTORY OF THE POPES FROM THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES. Drawn from the Secret Archives of the Vatican and Other Original Sources. From the German of Ludwig, Freiherr von Pastor. Edited by Ralph Francis Kerr, of the London Oratory. Vol. XXI: Sixtus V (1585-1590). Vol. XXII: Sixtus V (1585-1590), Urban VII (14-24 September, 1590), Gregory XIV (1590-1591) and Innocent IX (29 October–30 December, 1591). B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. 1932. Pp. xxxv—453 and xviii—467. Price, $5.00 each.

THE FRANCISCANS. By Alexandre Masseron. Translated from the French by Warre B. Wells. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1932. Pp. viii—233. Price, $1.90 *postpaid.*

THE PAULISTS. By James M. Gillis, C.S.P. Macmillan Co., New York. 1932. Pp. vii—67. Price, $1.00.

LACORDAIRE. Par Renée Zeller. (*Bibliotheque Catholique Illustrée.*) Bloud & Gay, Paris-6e. 1932. Pp. 56. Prix, 5 *fr.*

LA COMTESSE MARIE-THÉRÈSE LEDÓCHOWSKA. La Mère des Missions d'Afrique. Par Ugo Mioni. Traduit et adapté de l'italien. Marius E. Marietti, Turin et Rome. 1931. Pp. viii—234. Prix, 10 *fr.*

SOME LISTS OF CATHOLIC LAY TEACHERS AND THEIR ILLEGAL SCHOOLS IN LATER PENAL TIMES. With Historical Commentary, Special Maps and Illustrations. By T. Corcoran, S.J., D.Litt., Professor of Education, University College. Published for the Department of Education, University College, Dublin (National University of Ireland). M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., Dublin. 1932. Pp. 119. Price, 2/6 *net.*

A HISTORY OF THE WORK OF THE CISTERCIANS IN YORKSHIRE (1131-1300). By Francis Anthony Mullin, M.A. (Univ. of Iowa, 1925), Archdiocese of Dubuque. Dissertation Submitted to Faculty of Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Catholic University, Washington, D. C. 1932. Pp. xi—131.

THE SEMINARY MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES. Projects, Foundations and Early Development, 1833-1866. By William Stephen Morris, M.A. Dissertation Submitted to Faculty of Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Catholic University, Washington, D. C. 1932. Pp. viii—119.

THE COMTE DE VERGENNES. European Phases of His American Diplomacy (1774-1780). By John J. Meng, M.A. Dissertation Submitted to Faculty of Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Catholic University, Washington, D. C. 1932. Pp. 129.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF BELGIUM TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN AMERICA (1523-1857). By the Rev. Joseph A. Griffin, M.A. Dissertation Submitted to Faculty of Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. (*Studies in American Church History,* Vol. XIII. Under Direction of the Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday.) Catholic University, Washington, D. C. 1932. Pp. xvi—235.

MISCELLANEOUS.

TWOPENNY PAMPHLETS: B318, *St. Bernardine of Siena,* Apostle of Devotion to the Holy Name, 1380-1444. By Dominic Devas, O.F.M. Pp. 32. B319, *Ludovico Necchi,* a Leader of Catholic Action. By Monsignor Olgiata. Translated from the Italian by the Rev. Henry Louis Hughes, B.A. (Oxon), D.Litt. (Pisa). Pp. 72. D0122, *Christ, the King.* By the Rev. John O'Connor. Pp. 20. D0124, *The Order of Standing and Kneeling at Mass and Office.* Pp. 27. H211, *The Oxford Movement.* By the Rev. Henry Browne, S.J., M.A. (Oxon). Pp. 40. H217, *The New Papal State.* By Benedict Williamson. Pp. 28. S109, *The Catholic Land Movement.* Its Motives, by Father Vincent McNabb, O.P., S.T.M. Its Aims and Methods, by Commander Herbert Shove, D.S.O., R.N, Chairman of South of England Catholic Land Association. Foreword by G. K. Chesterton. Pp. 28. Catholic Truth Society, London, S.W. 1. 1932. Price, *twopence* each.

WHOSE COUNTRY IS THIS? By Daniel A. Lord, S.J. Queen's Work, St. Louis. 1932. Pp. 36. Price, $0.10; 50 copies, $4.00; 100, $7.00.

CATHERINE OF SIENA. A Play in Five Acts. By Albert R. Bandini. People Publishing Co., 40 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco. 1932. Pp. 103.

EVERYMAN. A Morality Play. The St. Bonaventure Version. By Joseph Yanner, M.A., Dramatic Director, St. Bonaventure's College, St. Bonaventure, N. Y. 1932. Pp. 54. Price, $0.75.

WORKBOOK IN CHEMISTRY. By Samuel Ralph Powers, Professor of Natural Sciences, Teachers' College, Columbia University; and Ruth Maude Johnson, Newtown High School, New York City. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1931. Pp. xi—306. Price, $1.00.

HEALTH WORKBOOK. By Philip L. Riley, B.S. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Supervisor, Health Education, Cleveland; Merritt A. Wight, M.A. (Columbia University), Principal, Outhwaite School, Cleveland; and William L. Connor, M.A. (Columbia University), Chief, Bureau of Educational Research, Cleveland. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1931. Pp. iv—195. Price, $0.60.

UNIT WORKBOOK IN SPELLING. By Laura S. Johnson. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1931. Pp. vii—178.

FIRST PRINCIPLES OF PHYSICS. By Robert W. Fuller, Raymond B. Brownlee and D. Lee Baker, all of Stuyvesant High School, New York City. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1932. Pp. viii—812.

ENGLAND OF SONG AND STORY. A Picture of Life in England and a Background for English Literature of the 16th, 17th and 18th Centuries. By Mary I. Curtis. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco. Dallas. 1931. Pp. xix—493.

LATIN AS LATIN. A Study Guide for Reading Classes. Teaches how to read Latin as Latin—how to translate. Explains sentence structure and word order. Builds a useful vocabulary. By Helen N. Gary, Central High School, Washington, D. C. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1930. Pp. vii—104. Price, $0.60.

TARGETS FOR ENGLISH PRACTICE. To Accompany *Elements of English Composition*. By Stella S. Center, Walton Junior-Senior High School, New York City, and Ethel E. Holmes, Principal of Wyman School, Denver. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1932. Pp. v—229.

TARGETS FOR ENGLISH PRACTICE. To Accompany *Elements of English*, Book One. By Stella S. Center, Walton High School, New York City, and Ethel E. Holmes, Principal of Wyman School, Denver. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1932. Pp. iv—193.

FIRST PRINCIPLES OF CHEMISTRY. By Raymond B. Brownlee and Robert W. Fuller, Stuyvesant High School; William J. Hancock, Erasmus Hall High School; Michael D. Sohon, Morris High School; and Jesse E. Whitsit, De Witt Clinton High School; all of New York City. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1931. Pp. vii—802.

UNIT WORKBOOK IN ALGEBRA. By Charles A. Stone, Laboratory Schools, University of Chicago, and Joel S. Georges, Crane Junior College, Chicago. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1931. Pp. ii—286. Price, $0.70.

THE WISELY-GIFFORD STANDARDIZED ENGLISH EXERCISES, II. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1931. Pp. 21.

THE LILY OF THE MOHAWKS (Kateri Tekakwitha). An Historical Romance Drama of the American Indian. By Edward C. La More, O.P. Music by Nellie Von Gerichten Smith. Dominicana, 487 Michigan Ave., N. E., Washington, D. C. 1932. Pp. 154 and 14. Price, net: $1.50; Musical Score, $1.00.

THE CATHOLIC BOOK SURVEY. Recommended Books. Fifth Series. Issued Quarterly. Cardinal Hayes Literature Committee, 23 East 51st Street, New York. June, 1932. Pp. 57. Price, $0.50 per year; $6.00 a hundred, $50.00 a thousand.

MY GUIDANCE SCRAPBOOK. Vocations. By Harold Lyman Holbrook and A. Laura McGregor. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1932. Pp. ii—214. Price, $0.60.

MY MUSICAL MEASURE. By Thomasine C. McGehee. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1932. Pp. 271. Price, $0.80.

WORKBOOK IN HOME MAKING. Outlined by Carlotta C. Greer, Head of Home Economics Department, John Hay High School, Cleveland. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1932. Pp. v—234. Price, $0.60.

ESSAYS FOR COLLEGE ENGLISH. Compiled by William E. Brennan, Marquette University. (*The Century Catholic College Texts*. John A. Lapp, Editor; Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Ph.D., Associate Editor for Education; George N. Shuster, A.M., Associate Editor for English.) Century Co., New York and London. 1931. Pp. x—451. Price, $2.00.

TRAVAILLONS! Work Book for the *New Chardenal*. Aide-toi, le ciel t'aidera. By W. H. Grosjean. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta, San Francisco, Dallas. 1932. Pp. viii—229. Price, $0.60.

PEANUT, THE BIG LITTLE MAN. By Gerald Kelly, S.J. Queen's Work, St. Louis. 1932. Pp. 18. Price, $0.05; 100 copies, $4.00.